CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

CENTER FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICER TRAINING

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
and
CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY

Conducted for
Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training

Miki Vohryzek-Bolden, Ph.D., CSU Sacramento, Criminal Justice Division
Peggy Giannoni, Ph.D. (c), CSU Sacramento, Center for Health and Human Services
Sue Cote, J.D., Ph.D., CSU Sacramento, Criminal Justice Division

October 2001

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers at California State University, Sacramento wish to express their appreciation for the tremendous support and assistance provided by the following agencies and departments:

- Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training
- Youth and Adult Correctional Agency
- California Department of Corrections
- California Youth Authority

Directors and staff from these agencies facilitated our work by keeping the relevant employees apprised of the research and making them available to us for interviews and other research activities. The completion of this project could not have been done without the assistance from all involved, including the training officers, correctional peace officers and supervisors.

We also acknowledge assistance from Bruce Bikle, Ph.D. and Stephanie Whitus, Ph.D. (c), from the Criminal Justice Division at CSU Sacramento, Randall C. MacIntosh, Ph.D., from the Department of Sociology at CSU Sacramento, and Tu Bui, M.S., Nam Tu, and Hilary Heckman, staff from the Center for Health and Human Services at CSU Sacramento.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The California Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training (CPOST) is required to develop, approve and monitor standards for the selection and training of state correctional peace officers. In June and September 1999, CPOST completed two reports, subsequently sent to the Governor and the Legislature, concerning the training standards for adult and juvenile correctional officers. The first report was entitled *Overview of Selected States' Academy and In-Service Training for Adult and Juvenile Correctional Employees*. It summarized the data gathered from a survey sent to every state adult and juvenile correctional agency requesting information on their academies and in-service training programs. In addition, it requested requirements for four employee classifications including entry-level correctional officers, first line supervisors (e.g., sergeants), second line supervisors (e.g., lieutenants) and parole agents. The comparison of California's current training requirements to the training requirements of other states suggests that California leads most states in both the length and comprehensiveness of training requirements for some of the correctional peace officer classifications discussed in the report.

The second report was entitled *California Department of Corrections and California Youth Authority Correctional Employees' and Supervisors' Assessment of the Effectiveness of Academy and Supervisors' Training*. It summarized the data gathered from 11 individual survey instruments designed to solicit input from various correctional peace officers regarding academy and supervisor training. The following employees were surveyed: correctional officers, youth correctional officers and counselors, sergeants, lieutenants, senior youth correctional counselors, institutional and field parole agents, and parole agents II's and III's at their respective institution/field office. The findings revealed that the training was moderately accepted and that additional training was necessary. Respondents also overwhelmingly supported active teaching strategies (e.g., hands-on, scenarios), on-the-job training during the academy, and an 8-hour maximum instructional day.

In accordance with Penal Code Section 13601 (a)(d)(f), CPOST's current effort includes developing a comprehensive description of in-service training (IST/7(k)) and on-the-job training (OJT) for rank-and-file correctional peace officers at adult and juvenile institutions,

parole regions and camps in California. Initially, existing training plans were obtained and reviewed, and basic data regarding the courses offered, number of hours and employees trained were collected. Correctional training officers were interviewed regarding their perceptions of IST/7(k) and OJT training.

Finally, survey instruments were designed to solicit input from rank-and-file correctional peace officers in both the California Department of Corrections (CDC) and the California Youth Authority (CYA) regarding their perceptions and recommendations regarding IST/7(k) and OJT. CDC Headquarter staff who are correctional peace officers were not surveyed due to the small numbers. Most of these staff members are also at the lieutenant level and are not within the class of employee surveyed as part of this research. Correctional peace officers currently in assignments involving transportation were also not surveyed due to their small numbers and difficulty with administering the survey instrument.

This report will provide:

- Background information regarding IST/7(k) and OJT requirements for state correctional peace officers;
- Overview of the research design, including survey sampling procedures;
- Description of existing IST/7(k) and OJT training in state correctional institutions, camps and parole regions;
- Correctional training officers' perception of IST/7(k) and OJT training; Correctional officer, correctional counselor, youth correctional officer, youth correctional counselor, casework specialist, parole agent, firefighter and medical technical assistant ratings of the quality and usefulness of their training and suggestions for improvement; and
- CDC supervisors' perception of the quality and usefulness of IST/7(k) and OJT.

For ease of reading, tables will be referenced and can be found in a separate document entitled *Supporting Document*. The letter S precedes all tables that can be found in the *Supporting Document*. Due to incomplete responses to a number of questions, the reference to the total number of respondents to a particular question may not equal the total number

who returned the survey instrument. In addition, in the section of the report where data is reported from employee surveys, the number in parentheses after the percent indicates the number of respondents.

BACKGROUND

The research focused on two types of training: in-service and on-the-job training for rank and file correctional peace officers in CDC and CYA. The Department Operations Manual (DOM) for CDC defines in-service training as any formal training sponsored and conducted by any state agency. The Institutions and Camps Manual for CYA defines in-service training as training initiated by the department, branch or institution. The operations manuals for both CDC and CYA suggest that in-service training includes formal, structured classroom instruction. The 7(k) training program described below is also referred to as in-service training.

The collective bargaining agreement (hereinafter referred to as agreement) negotiated in late summer 1998 between the State of California and the California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA), which represents Bargaining Unit 6 in corrections (i.e., youth and adult correctional peace officers), required additional in-service training for these employee groups. This agreement recognized the need for structured and improved correctional training programs.

The training is referred to as the 7(k) program, which is a reference to Section 207(k) of the federal Fair Labor Standards Act. The new program created an exemption to the 160-hour maximum work time in a 28-day work period, allowing the employees covered under the agreement to work (or receive training) 168 hours in the 28-day work period. Since 7(k) has in effect become the in-service training vehicle for most adult and juvenile correctional peace officers, we will use that reference. The term in-service training will be used where it is in addition to the 7(k) training.

The 7(k) program includes 52 hours of annual training. According to the agreement, this training must be either individual or group formalized, structured courses of instruction to acquire skills and knowledge for an employee's current or future job performance. These organized activities must contain measurable learning objectives that can be evaluated in a classroom setting or in structured on-the-job training. The agreement also stated that CDC and CYA agree to incorporate CPOST approved courses within the training program. The

training scheduled to begin October 5, 1998 for CDC and October 4, 1998 for CYA was delayed for one work period for planning and scheduling purposes.

The agreement established specific training schedules and conditions for each employee classification, elements of which are described below:

- CDC and CYA Institutional Based Employees: four hours of training every 28-day work period, where each training class shall be at least 1-hour in duration and scheduled in a 4-hour session. The employee groups include correctional officer, youth correctional officer, youth correctional counselor, and medical technical assistant.
- CDC and CYA Permanent Intermittent Employees (PIEs): 52 hours of training annually as assigned by management.
- Non-Institutionalized Based Employees: 52 hours of training annually. This training must be scheduled during the employee's normal work hours or on the employee's regular day off (RDO). Six of the seven trainings scheduled on the RDO shall be at least 8 hours in duration. Correctional officers at CDC and CYA camps are included in this category.
- Non-Posted Employees – CYA Field Parole Agent, Institutional Based Parole Agent, Casework Specialist, Community Services Consultant, Fire Service Training Specialist; and CDC Parole Agent I and Parole Agent II Specialist: 52 hours of training annually with scheduling by management.
- CDC Firefighters: full-time CDC firefighters on 24-hour shifts, who work up to 216 hours in a 28-day work period, receive 52 hours of training a year with scheduling by management.
- Non-Posted Employees – CDC Correctional Counselor and Correctional Counselor II Specialist: 13 hours of training per calendar quarter, no later than 14 days prior to the beginning of the work period and not on an employee's RDO. A minimum of 50 percent of the hours shall be in a classroom setting. The remaining may be structured on-the-job training (i.e., interactive training between a knowledgeable person and the student).

The work period for most of these correctional employee classifications was 168 hours in a recurring 28-day work period. Posted employees (i.e., correctional officer, firefighter, medical technical assistant, youth correctional officer and youth correctional counselor) were allowed 4 hours of the 168 hours for pre and post work activities (PPWA). Non-posted employees (i.e., casework specialist, correctional counselor I, correctional counselor II specialist, institutional and field parole agent, parole agent I, parole agent II specialist) were required to schedule 168 hours of regular posted duty per work period and receive the 52 hours of formal training, as part of 7(k), within those 168 hours. They did not receive the PPWA hours and were required to account for those additional four hours through such activities as case contacts, service referrals, community/law enforcement activities and other activities related to their respective responsibilities.

Both CDC and CYA describe on-the-job training (OJT) as an activity conducted by a supervisor (or a designated employee with the required expertise under the direction of a supervisor) at the job site while the employee is working. OJT tends to be far less structured than IST and is designed to informally address any deficiencies and enhance employee performance. CDC has specific requirements for OJT and the training officers track it at the institutions. CYA's institutional training staff do not track OJT and are unable to document the depth and breadth of OJT in the units. A more complete description of correctional peace officer training requirements for CDC and CYA can be found in Appendix 1.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

Research Design

The research entailed five primary activities:

1. Review available information on 7(k) and OJT at all correctional institutions, camps and parole regions.
2. Develop and administer an interview schedule for IST/7(k) training officers in CDC and CYA.
3. Develop, pre-test and administer a survey instrument to gather 7(k) employee perceptions regarding 7(k) and OJT.
4. Conduct focus group interviews with CDC supervisors to gather their perception of 7(k) and OJT, specifically as it relates to improved employee job performance.
5. Conduct focus group interviews with CYA field parole agents to gather more detailed and explanatory information regarding 7(k) training.

(All interview and survey instruments are located in Appendix 2).

Sampling Procedures

Training Information

All institutions, camps and parole regions in CDC and CYA were sent letters from designated central office representatives requesting information about the 7(k) training offered since its inception through the middle of 2000. In CDC, there are 33 institutions, 38 camps (16 north and 22 south) and four parole regions. In CYA, there are 11 institutions, four camps, and two parole regions. Each institution, camp and parole region were specifically asked to provide a list and description of courses offered, number of class sessions, number of employees trained, and to provide any available lesson plans.

CDC and CYA both have information systems that maintain data on training courses. There are, however, deficiencies in these tracking systems that resulted in discrepancies in the kind and quality of information provided to the researchers. Respondents provided whatever information they had available.

Training Officer Interviews

California Department of Corrections

All in-service training (IST) managers (i.e., lieutenants) and sergeants, and 7(k) sergeants in the 33 CDC institutions were contacted by the Field Services Training Unit in CDC to schedule an interview. In-person interviews were conducted with all but one of the IST managers and/or 7(k) sergeants. A telephone interview was conducted with one training manager.

The training officer within each of the four parole regions and the officers responsible for training at selected camps were also interviewed. The respondents were asked general questions about 7(k) implementation, the process for selection of training courses, description of instructional strategies and assessment techniques for 7(k) training, their perception of whether this training has improved employee performance, and any recommendations for improvement of the 7(k) training program. Respondents were also asked to describe on-the-job training within their institution, camp or parole region.

California Youth Authority

The training officers at each of the 11 institutions in CYA were interviewed. Two camp training officers were also contacted for telephone interviews. The respondents were asked the same questions asked of the CDC-IST managers. In addition, since the training for parole agents was coordinated at the office/district level, no training officer was interviewed at the regional level. The researchers relied on the training data submitted as part of the initial request for information.

Employee Surveys

There were four individual surveys developed – two for CDC and two for CYA. Respondents were asked to rate the quality, course organization, and usefulness of the training received in designated subject areas. They were also asked to indicate how confident, after training, they felt about performing their duties and responsibilities and applying the principles gained in 7(k) to work-related situations. Respondents were also asked to rate a variety of instructional delivery methods to determine whether they helped

them learn the material or apply the skills, and to comment on their overall impression of 7(k) and any recommendations they would make to improve this training. When officers indicated they received on-the-job training, they were asked if it helped them perform their duties more effectively.

The following employee groups at CDC's institutions and camps completed the survey instrument: correctional officer; correctional counselor I; correctional counselor II specialist; firefighter; and medical technical assistant. Parole agent I and parole agent II specialists completed the second survey instrument (see Appendix 3 for the number of respondents by location).

The CDC-IST managers and 7(k) sergeants were requested by the department to administer the employee surveys at the institutions. Prior to distribution of the surveys, the sergeants read a statement provided by the researchers that ensured anonymity and confidentiality of all survey results. The sergeants were asked to distribute the survey to every person attending 7(k) training on the busiest primary training day within the first two weeks of the work period starting January 22, 2001, and to repeat this same process on the busiest make-up day within the second two weeks of the same work period. This would provide researchers with a representative sample of employees from each institution and within each of the represented 7(k) employee classifications.

A separate mailing was sent to institutions where the correctional counselors do the majority of their training outside the IST office. In those cases, we requested that they distribute the survey to the supervising officer coordinating the training for the correctional counselors. In addition, the two institutions with oversight responsibility for the camps were asked to distribute and collect surveys for the camp employees.

Regional parole administrators in regions I and III distributed individual, self-addressed stamped envelopes to their parole agents. Regional parole administrators in regions II and IV distributed the survey instruments to their parole agents, collected them, and returned them to the researchers.

The following five employee groups at CYA's institutions and camps completed the survey: youth correctional officer; youth correctional counselor; casework specialist; institutional parole agent 1; and medical technical assistant. The training officers at each institution and camp were asked to distribute the surveys to all 7(k) employees during the April 2001 28-day work period. Field parole agent 1 and parole agent II specialists completed another survey instrument, which was distributed to them in May and June 2001 during parole refresher training (see Appendix 3 for the number of respondents by location).

Focus Groups

CDC sergeants and lieutenants attending three supervisor academy training sessions in June and July 2001 participated in focus groups that sought to obtain their perceptions of 7(k) and on-the-job training for correctional employees. Focus group interviews were also conducted with CYA field parole agents during their parole refresher training. Researchers also had the opportunity to conduct one focus group with approximately 25-30 correctional counselor I and correctional counselor II specialists in CDC. The hallmark of focus groups is their use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found within a group.

FINDINGS RELATED TO 7(k) TRAINING

California Department of Corrections

7(k) Training Course Offerings in Institutions

Each institution was asked to provide information on courses offered under 7(k) for the review period beginning October 5, 1998 and ending with the 7(k) work period of May 12, 2000. The specific information requested included class names, number of sessions, length of class, number of staff trained, and any available lesson plans that include course title, class length, target population, performance objectives and evaluation procedures.

The information was received in various formats and did not lend itself to a quantitative analysis (e.g., number of sessions indicated if class offered on one day, not if it was offered three times on that one day). In addition, many institutions indicated that data collection on 7(k) training did not begin until early 1999. Thus, caution must be exercised when generalizing any of these findings to any particular institution or all the institutions statewide.

We collapsed all the courses into 12 training areas and aggregated the data statewide. The 12 training areas are:

- Casework (offenders with mental disorders)
- Communications (oral and written)
- Departmental (ADA, sexual harassment)
- Firearms (qualification)
- Health (bloodborne pathogens, CPR)
- Inmate control (cell extraction, searches)
- Law enforcement (evidence preservation, investigations)
- Legal (*Clark*)
- Safety procedures (key/tool control)
- Staff-inmate relations (over familiarity)
- Use of force (physical, mechanical, chemical restraints)
- Other (gangs, holiday awareness)

Institutions offered approximately 275,808 hours of use of force training during this 20-month period (see Table 1). Other areas where there were significant training hours include safety procedures (224,646 hours), inmate control (199,198 hours), health (118,408 hours) and firearms (118,197 hours). When looking at the number of staff trained, a significant number of 7(k) employees statewide received training in safety procedures (N=177,349), inmate control (N=143,926) and use of force (N=129,137). There were a significant number of sessions offered in safety procedures (N=9,923), inmate control (N=7,762), use of force (N=6,873), firearms (N=5,087), and health (N=4,058). Staff also received training on departmental issues, including the court-mandated training as a result of the *Clark* and *Armstrong* cases, investigations, evidence preservation and health issues, including CPR and first aid.

Table 1. CDC Training Courses by Number of Session, Number of Staff Trained, and Total Training Hours, October 5, 1998 – May 12, 2000

Training Courses	Number of Sessions	Number Staff Trained	Total Training Hours
Casework	2,620	38,577	51,292
Communications	1,159	22,976	36,408
Departmental	3,305	55,296	79,742
Firearms training	5,087	67,948	118,198
Health	4,058	74,220	118,409
Inmate control	7,762	143,926	199,199
Law enforcement	1,486	28,671	38,194
Legal	1,620	43,780	66,234
Safety procedures	9,923	177,349	224,646
Staff-inmate relations	1,222	22,646	30,168
Use of Force	6,873	129,137	275,809
Other	1,039	42,150	37,055

The training areas where there were significant numbers of staff trained and sessions offered also coincided with the mandated training for correctional peace officers. For example, correctional peace officers must qualify quarterly on their firearms and receive training annually in use of force. We learned throughout this research that for the institutions, the training formerly offered as part of block and/or annual training was now offered under the 7(k) training umbrella.

A review of available lesson plans indicated that many courses included exams (e.g., written, true/false, multiple choice) and others included demonstration and practical application. A number of institutions also use classroom discussion or assign managerial staff to audit courses periodically as another means of course assessment. Finally, several institutions

used verbal quizzes to assess proficiency. It should be noted that at the time this research was conducted, there were few CPOST approved lesson plans, which explains the paucity of lesson plans submitted by the institutions. As we would learn during the interviews with institutional training staff, many training managers and 7(k) sergeants were developing their own lesson plans for use at their respective institution.

Institutional Training Officers' Perception of 7(k) Training From Interviews

The IST managers and 7(k) sergeants and/or designated training officers were asked a number of questions dealing with:

- implementation of the 7(k) training program;
- course selection and scheduling;
- program impact on employee performance;
- usefulness of the training tracking system; and
- overall impressions of and recommendations for the 7(k) training program

Many respondents recognized that implementation of the 7(k) training program created a vehicle and more formal structure for mandated training. Some training officers also suggested that it was their understanding that this new structure was to open up opportunities for new, specialized training, not just the same old mandatory/block training. However, this formal structure led to increased compliance by employees with their training mandates. Thus, in some cases, it minimized the use of progressive discipline for non-compliance.

The 7(k) program also shifted responsibility for compliance. In the past, it was the officer's responsibility to ensure s/he completed the 40 hours of mandated training; now it is the responsibility of the IST office to track all training and ensure compliance. The permanent intermittent employees (PIE's, also referred to as permanent intermittent correctional officer - PICO), however, are more difficult to ensure compliance because they work when they want and their workdays/hours may not coincide with the training schedule.

Several respondents indicated that it improved some officers' knowledge and skills. Another comment was that "7(k) opened the door for more information and some officers really like

to train." Many training officers felt that the concept of 7(k) was good, but that there was a need to streamline the delivery system. Finally, one comment made by many respondents was that "the instructor was the key," regardless of the quality of the course material or course content. The learning potential was limited if the instructor was bad.

Each institution created its own structure for offering the training. The first two weeks of the work period is known as the 'primary' training period, which means that each employee has a set date on which s/he may come for training. The second two weeks of the work period is known as the 'make-up' period. When the agreement was first signed, employees were required to attend training on their designated training day during the first two-week primary training period. As of early 2000, employees can select their training day either during the primary or make-up training period, or come in on their regular day off. The last few days of the make-up period have the highest attendance rate for almost all the institutions.

Correctional counselors and correctional counselor II specialists, per the contract, receive 13 hours of training per quarter, 50 percent of which must be in a classroom setting and the rest can be structured on-the-job training. Some institutions have a scheduled training day for correctional counselors. Since they do not receive the four hours for pre and post work activities, they submit their monthly schedule of 168 hours to their supervisors for approval.

Several institutions, in an attempt to equalize the attendance throughout the 28-day work period, post a sign-up sheet in a central area. This is used, in particular, with size-restricted classes such as baton, chemical agents, and range. When used to schedule all the training, it helped the 'procrastinators' meet their training obligation in a more timely fashion. Employees who sign-up for a particular time are not 'mandated' under all circumstances to attend a particular class. It does, however, give the training staff the necessary information to provide instructor coverage (e.g., range) for the class, and may reduce instructional budgets for overtime and 'pay behind' costs.

Most institutions set aside at least three days each week for training, and others offer up to 18 days of training within a work period. The training hours can extend from a minimum of

four hours to 12 or more hours in one day. In one instance, classes run all day (i.e., rolling class concept) and employees can come in at any hour and take their 4-hour block of training.

A couple of institutions allow employees with alternative start times (i.e., outside the main shift periods) to split their four hour training by attending two hours before their shift and two hours after their shift. Another institution allows officers to select their classes during the 28-day work period, as long as they satisfy the 4-hour requirement and attend a whole class. Correctional counselors get most of their 7(k) training in their unit and usually attend training in the IST office when it is a universally mandated class (e.g., *Clark*).

The discussions with the training officers also revealed that the 4-hour block set aside for 7(k) training does not necessarily result in four hours of actual training. Officers must walk from their post to the classroom, which in some instances could take up to 15 or 20 minutes. In addition, many instructors give a 10-minute break each hour.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they include non-custody staff in their 7(k) training blocks and to describe any advantages and disadvantages to such an arrangement. A small number of institutions include non-custody staff with their 7(k) training. They indicated that where the class is mandated for all department employees (e.g., bloodborne pathogens), they would inform all staff of the class and encourage the non-custody staff to attend.

The advantages of training custody and non-custody staff together include: enhance mutual understanding of respective roles and responsibilities; foster better relationships between custody and non-custody staff; respond to two training mandates at once and save money; and improve understanding of issues (e.g., inmate-staff relations). While one training officer indicated that for certain classes you might need to separate custody from non-custody, few articulated any major disadvantages to joint training. They did recognize, however, that the different mind-sets of custody and non-custody staff influence the viability of joint training. Thus, the issue seems to be related to facility capacity, institutional culture and past practices.

The interviews revealed the respondents' commitment to quality training. The IST managers and 7(k) sergeants recognize the importance of training and its potential for improving employee performance. What was also evident was a frustration with several key aspects of implementation and the training process and procedures (Chart 1 in Appendix 4 contains a summary of the following):

- *Insufficient lead-time to implement the mandate at the institutional level*. They were informed of the agreement and asked to implement within a very short time period beginning in October 1998: "Each institution had to wing it." There was also some confusion on the part of the employees regarding the new training requirements. One overall assessment was that even beyond the challenges with implementation, the department needed to provide better direction and support for training.
- *Limited classroom space*. Many institutions have only one classroom and must use alternative space, such as the visiting center, if the classroom is unavailable.
- *Insufficient number of qualified (i.e., training-for-trainers (T-4-T) certified, subject matter experts, and/or interested instructors available)*. Several respondents indicated that they had a relatively small pool of both interested and qualified instructors. Some staff who were T-4-T'd declined to teach. In some cases, this placed additional burden on training office staff to provide most of the training. Several respondents also indicated that local rules (i.e., warden) limit the pool of potential instructors by not allowing supervisors from the institution to serve as instructors. Using supervisors as instructors was beneficial because it didn't require the training office to pay behind an instructor, but it also created situations where supervisors had to cancel to handle an incident on the yard/unit.
- *Potentially high training costs*. The more recent agreement between the department and the union allows certain 7(k) employee to select any day for training. This has presented a challenge for the training office. For example, during the work period when quarterly range is offered, the IST office must have a range master and range safety officer available for all training periods. In one instance, this required the range to be available for 52 hours, since employees had the flexibility to select any 4-hour training block. In several instances, there were as few as one or two people on the range.

- *Few available standardized lesson plans*. While the agreement required use of CPOST approved lesson plans, there are not many approved at this time. Thus, each institution had to generate its own lesson plans, borrow from other institutions, or modify lesson plans approved for the basic academy. There was variable quality in the lesson plans reviewed by the researcher.
- *Inability to plan*. Most the training courses offered are either statutorily mandated (e.g., PC 832, firearms), litigation driven (*Clark* case dealing with developmental disability, *Armstrong* case dealing with physically disabled placements), administratively mandated through departmental directives, or locally authorized. There were several instances described in which the IST office was directed by the department, on short notice, to offer a particular training course. This required them to readjust their training schedule, still recognizing that some employee might now be deficient in an annual training mandate because of the shift.
- *Limited institutional flexibility*. Several respondents noted that sometimes, when the department or one of its office units mandates training, they have no ability to teach the class as they deem appropriate. For example, in one case, they are restricted from using a video for training purposes. The officers noted that this would be helpful, especially if there is only one person in the room or the instructor is unavailable. One specific comment made by several training officers was that much of the material in the *Clark* and *Armstrong* lesson plans was repetitive.
- *Inadequate computerized training tracking system.* Each institution uses a database that distorts actual training offered at the institution (e.g., can't differentiate training by employee classification, input of transfer employee data), limits the type and nature of reports that can be generated, and contains numerous deficiencies that cannot be rectified with the current system.

Almost without exception, respondents stated that most 7(k) employees participate in the 4-hours of training after their 8-hour shift, making for a long workday. Employees can do their 7(k) training on their regular day off, though most opt for the one longer day in the 28-day work period. Most training staff indicated that 7(k) employees liked the extra pay but not the long workday. The perceived negative effect from a long workday is exacerbated

when an employee is on a 4-day/10 hour schedule. They also stated that employees on first watch (i.e., 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. shift) were particularly vulnerable to the effects of the long day. Most training officers noted that they used different techniques to keep the attention of these employees.

All of the institutions have a disciplinary process in place for non-compliance. Though, as was indicated earlier, compliance with training mandates appears to be fairly high. For those employees out-of-compliance, the institutions use progressive discipline from verbal warning, letter of contact (LOC), letter of instruction (LOI) and mandatory attendance on the primary day, and finally to an adverse action. In most first violation cases, the officer is required to attend training on his/her designated training day for six months. Some institutions go straight to the LOI for first violation, based on their interpretation of the mandatory language in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). When an employee has no valid excuse for missing the training (e.g., extended medical leave), the institution will dock his/her pay for that work period.

In terms of the instructional strategies, most respondents indicated using lecture, power point and hands-on techniques for the training. Some also used a pretest to determine employees' current knowledge and would then focus on the areas of deficiency. Other training officers indicated that they hand the quiz out in the beginning of class and let participants complete the quiz as the class proceeds. Many officers also perceive that they must adhere very strictly to the lesson plan, which requires them to read the material verbatim in order to ensure that all the content is covered. This perception appears to limit instructor creativity in terms of using alternative instructional strategies (e.g., discussion groups and scenarios) to deliver the required course content.

The training staff use a variety of assessment techniques including tests, quizzes, question and answer, and performance. The use of these techniques, however, did not appear to be on a consistent basis. Training staff used some discretion in determining when a test or quiz was necessary or optional. Performance tests were used most consistently in the training

areas requiring some physical competency (e.g., baton, application of protective gear, and range).

Most respondents indicated that there is little if any in-service training beyond 7(k). This is partly due to no time and no additional financial resources to offer the training. One institution indicated that on occasion, it sent a qualified instructor, with a lesson plan, to the work site to conduct a class. The unit would shut down for an hour or so in order to offer the training to all employees. When asked about the use of video conferencing for training (i.e., two-way audio/video), training officers overwhelmingly support the idea. They indicated that it would be most effective with small groups and would save institutions money, including instructor and travel costs.

Finally, the IST staff perceived that while a core group accepted the training, most employees were not enthused about the 7(k) program, especially because of the long workday. Thus, there appeared to be mixed feelings about the training: some viewed it as a burden, others saw the potential and benefit, and most would prefer an alternative schedule, such as offering the training on work time (e.g., during an employee's 8-hour workday). The training staff suggested that in some cases it improved employee performance.

Best Practices

The interviews with the training officers revealed the use of some innovative, unique and/or accommodating institutional strategies and practices to deliver training. In some cases these innovations applied to non-custody training, as well as the training offered under the 7(k) program. The training officers indicated that the use of these different strategies increased the involvement of the officers and enhanced their learning.

The responses can be classified into three categories: curriculum design and development; scheduling; and instructional delivery and strategies.

Curriculum design and development:

- Development of self-paced instruction manual and lesson plans that respond to employee needs (e.g., gangs)
- Shared lesson plans between institutions
- Incorporating report writing into other training (e.g., in use of force class, have participants write an 837 report)
- Ancillary academy for non-custody staff (though now unavailable) – 40 hours training off-site to deal with issues such as custody and security

Scheduling:

- Staggered start times to accommodate traditional watch schedules and alternative work schedules
- Mix mandatory training class with training of interest to employees (e.g., domestic violence) in order to increase attention span
- Schedule special classes for employees who need to meet annual training mandates
- Place sign-up sheets in entrance areas where officers pass on their way to post, especially useful with size-restricted classes

Instructional delivery and strategies:

- Continual use of hands-on training (e.g., crime scene preservation, cell extraction, body searches)
- Game format (e.g., Jeopardy and Who Wants To Be A Millionaire)
- Development of instructional videos designed to meet unique needs of institution and save money (e.g., flex cuffing to show all different ways to do it without major cost for individual practice applications)
- Table top exercises with stick figures and institutional plot plans – incident review and response training that helps with mental imagery and muscle memory
- Team teaching
- Ask trivia questions during first five minutes of class to get participants involved (reward with candy)
- Joint training with custody and non-custody staff

- Institutional Web site (i.e., intranet) with lesson plans and related training materials available to all staff and supervisors

These practices all strengthen the training offered to employees and may influence employee perception of their training and its affect on their work performance.

Conclusions

There are many conclusions one can draw from the information gleaned from the interviews with the IST managers and 7(k) sergeants:

- The number of 7(k) employees in the institution and type of programs offered (e.g., substance abuse treatment) affect training in terms of scheduling and ensuring compliance with training mandates for those in specialized programs. Multiple employee start times also create a scheduling challenge.
- Most 7(k) employees do not like the extra 4 hours after an 8-hour work shift, but have come to accept it as part of their job.
- 7(k) training took precedence over all other training and had a negative effect on what the training office could offer to supervisors and non-custody staff.
- Supervisors' ability to remediate and respond to 7(k) officer deficiencies through on-the-job training may be hampered because the supervisors do not receive similar training.
- In most cases, the IST managers and 7(k) sergeants had little knowledge regarding the actual training offered to correctional counselor I and correctional counselor II specialists. They do in most cases, however, record the training information in their database.
- Most of 7(k) training is mandated (i.e., litigation driven, departmental directive, statutory, or local rule) and leaves little if any time to offer training in other areas (e.g., gangs, office processes, advanced writing skills). The extensive number of mandated classes may result from, as one respondent stated, "over-paranoia regarding liability."

- Most IST staff developed their own lesson plans, which results in a significant duplication of effort. Training officers indicated that this related to the fact that there are few, if any, CPOST approved lesson plans.
- When employees were provided the flexibility to attend any training day during the 28-day work-period, most would show up the last day or two. In some cases, this posed problems of facility capacity. It also raises the issue of quality of instruction, both for those classes with one or two students and the large classes with 50 or 60 students. In addition, if an employee had to attend because s/he was satisfying a mandate that needed to be met immediately, the employee had to be accommodated, regardless of capacity.
- Some officers with more than two years on the job got "burnt out" on some of the training because the instructors taught from the same lesson plans. Thus, employees received the same information year after year. Training staff indicated that this was partially due to inadequate staff time to revise and redraft lesson plans, and as indicated earlier, few CPOST approved lesson plans.
- Instructional innovations were limited because the training staff understood that some, if not all, lesson plans had to be read verbatim. If not, it would expose the department and its employees to lawsuits if the courts determine that staff were not provided all necessary information on a particular topic. Some IST managers also understood that if PowerPoint and/or a video were not included as part of the CPOST course approval packet, they could not be used in the classroom. These understandings contributed to a frustration for instructors and boredom for participants.
- In those institutions where one instructor from the training office does all the training, concerns arise regarding quality of instruction and student learning. In some cases, this situation occurs because of the unavailability of other instructors and the mandated costs to pay behind an instructor from a posted position. In other situations, individuals who are T-4-T'd decline to instruct and the training office staff are unable to require these employees to serve as instructors in the 7(k) program.

- In other institutions, the IST office works with the captains in the units to identify instructors for the courses. These instructors are then directed to teach on a particular day, whether or not they are interested. This creates the potential for bad instruction.
- More training videos would be used but the cost of purchasing the videos is prohibitive.
- Many training staff perceive that the department is not behind training, as is evidenced by insufficient funds (e.g., instructor costs, office supplies).
- The existing database is severely flawed and limits the ability of the institution to effectively monitor its training. Tracking training statewide is also hampered because institutions are not always using the same codes.

Recommendations

Perhaps the four most significant recommendations for improving 7(k) training require departmental support to:

1. Develop and provide a new computerized training tracking system that allows the training office staff to generate useable reports, monitor actual training, document non-compliance, monitor officers' training mandates, and provide other needed information as determined by the institution and the department.
2. Standardize lesson plans and course content for core courses (including the use of reality-based scenarios), use as much non-technical language as possible, and place them on the department Web site. Include within those standardized lesson plans an area where each institution can incorporate information, strategies or techniques unique to that institution. Individual training managers must consider physical plant lay-out, institutional mission, specialized programs and inmate populations, and custody level of the institution. Also, design curricula to meet learning objectives and competencies, not a specific time length.
3. Provide a T-4-T instructor program that is offered to all institutions on a regular basis. As a part of this program, require individuals completing the program to provide a minimum number of instructor hours in order to retain their certification. In addition, include some specialized training for mandated classes (e.g., *Clark*, sexual harassment, use of force).

4. Hire an additional training staff person who could teach, assist supervisors with on-the-job training, mentor new instructors, and assist all the instructors with class preparation. This position would reduce overtime or pay behind costs for instructors, and provide additional time and resources to enhance available in-service and supervisor training.

A related issue to the T-4-T instructor training was the development of an advanced training program for training office staff that would include, at a minimum, general training skills and classroom presentation strategies. Respondents also saw the need for additional monies to purchase supplies (including training videos, CD-ROM, PowerPoint, and manuals) and cover instructor costs. The training monies available at a particular institution might vary because of local allotments. Thus, one institution could offer more training than another institution. Several respondents indicated that those institutions with substance abuse beds have additional monies for specialized training that alleviates the fiscal responsibility of the IST office. A related recommendation that would minimize the fiscal constraints on the individual training offices was to have the academy staff develop training videos for use by the institutions, camps and parole regions.

Several respondents recommended that the department standardize the training schedule statewide for some of the mandatory classes (e.g., bloodborne pathogens, use of force). This would ensure that all employees received the training at the same time and were in compliance with training mandates, especially those required annually. It would also minimize the burden on the IST office to accommodate officers who need to complete an annual requirement immediately (e.g., transfer employee). If the needed training is not offered, IST must make all necessary arrangements, including hiring an instructor and paying the officer overtime to complete the training mandate. This recommendation recognizes that some annual or quarterly training, such as range, must be scheduled to accommodate weather conditions, such as extreme heat and cold.

A related scheduling recommendation was to allow institutions to schedule training that afforded employees the opportunity to take a 2-hour class on one day and a second 2-hour

class on another day. One institution currently provides its employees the flexibility to complete their 4-hour training mandate by attending individual classes, regardless of length (e.g., 1-hour, 2-hour, 3-hour). The only stipulation is that the employee completes the whole class. They noted that this accommodation might result in better learning and minimize the burden placed on the officers to remain an additional four hours after an 8-hour shift.

As indicated earlier, much of the training offered in 7(k) is in essence mandated, whether by the legislature, department, courts, or wardens. The respondents indicated some concern with the content and instructional requirements for certain court-mandated training. Thus, one recommendation would be to have a training officer present during the negotiations between the department and the court. This would benefit the department in two ways: the meetings would include an individual who trains and understands the implications of any decisions on training; and the final agreements may result in a training program that meets the needs of the court and is workable from a training perspective.

Several training officers expressed concerns with selected course content. In some instances, the lesson plans have not been revised in years, yet the training is mandated annually. This situation poses a particular challenge with the veteran officers who were bored with the same training, year after year. There was also a strong consensus that the officers need much more hands-on training.

Respondents recommended that the department re-evaluate all of its annual training mandates and assess whether some could be offered in the on-the-job format. On-site training (e.g., unit or yard) could be scheduled by suspending inmate programming or closing morning yard for a short period and providing advance notice to staff and inmates. One respondent suggested that if inmates know and it becomes a regular part of their routine, there is no resistance to shutting down programs for short periods. One benefit of such an arrangement would be the increased training time available to respond to institutional needs.

The respondents were mixed in terms of their support for the new arrangement that allowed officers to attend training on the day of their choice. They recognized that many 7(k) officers

found this to be more acceptable because it gave them the flexibility to determine what day was best for them. On the other hand, it created havoc in the planning process and led to increased costs. Instructors had to be available for all class times, even when there was only one employee in the room. Thus, several respondents recommended that at a minimum, they be allowed to schedule certain classes at specific times (e.g., quarterly range in a two-day block) and require employees to attend during those training days. These arrangements could be negotiated at the institutional level.

The researchers learned during the interviews that it is common practice to rotate the IST manager, sergeant and 7(k) sergeant into the training office for a two-year term and then return them to their posted position. One positive aspect of this arrangement is that the training office staff have current knowledge of institutional issues and concerns. The downside is that they are transferred out of the training office just as they become proficient in their training roles and responsibilities. The department may want to examine this practice and determine whether it should allow a longer appointment term, when requested by the training officer.

A training issue unrelated to 7(k) employees was the issue of in-service training for supervisors. The majority of the training managers expressed the need to expand the training opportunities for supervisors, especially in those content areas covered in the mandatory classes for 7(k) employees. Their perception is that this would enhance the ability of supervisors to remediate with an employee and strengthen their on-the-job training skills.

Employee Perception of 7(k) Training From Survey Responses

Characteristics of Respondents

Correctional officers, correctional counselor I's, correctional counselor II specialists, firefighters, and medical technical assistants (MTAs) were asked their perceptions of and recommendations for the 7(k) training program (see Appendix 2). A total of 4,658 employees at 33 institutions and 79 employees at the camps responded to the survey. Table 2, on the following page, presents the number of respondents by employee classification. On average, correctional counselors had the longest years of service (correctional counselor I -

12.7 years; correctional counselor II specialist- 19.6 years), while medical technical assistants had the fewest years of service (6.8 years). Correctional officers and firefighters had averages of 7.9 and 7.5 years respectively.

Table 2. Number of CDC Employees Responding by 7(k) Employee Class

Employee Class	*N*
Institution	
Correctional Officer	*3671*
Correctional Counselor I	*292*
Correctional Counselor II, Spec.	*19*
Firefighter	*8*
Medical Technical Assistant	*153*
Unknown	*515*
Camp	
Correctional Officer	*70*
Unknown	*9*

Most institutional employees with one year of service or less worked the third watch while the majority of those with more than one year of service worked the second watch. Most camp employees worked the third watch (see S-Table 1). Chart 2 in Appendix 4 resents a summary of 7(k) employees' responses to survey questions.

Overall Assessment of 7(k) Training: Instructional Quality, Organization, and Usefulness of Courses

CDC employees were asked to rate the overall quality of 7(k) training in terms of instruction, organization, and usefulness of the course content, and then rate each training area separately. The training covers 11 areas:

- Communications (e.g., oral and written)
- Departmental (e.g., policies and procedures, ethics)
- Firearms training (e.g., range)
- Health (e.g., bloodborne pathogens, CPR, first aid)
- Inmate control (e.g., cell extraction, searches);
- Legal (e.g., *Clark* and *Armstrong* cases, ADA)
- Law enforcement (e.g., preservation of evidence)
- Safety procedures (e.g., fire prevention, key/tool control)
- Staff-inmate relations (e.g., over familiarity)
- Casework (e.g., MSF, 812, 128G)
- Use of force options (e.g., baton, chemical agent)

If applicable, respondents could also indicate additional training areas if they were not listed on the survey instrument.

On the whole, institutional and camp employees indicated moderate satisfaction with 7(k) training in terms of instructional quality, organization, and usefulness of courses (see S-Table 2). Approximately 69 percent (N=2,796) of institutional employees indicated that instructional quality was good, and approximately 50 percent indicated that courses were fairly well organized (N=2,224) and the course content was useful (N=2,092). Camp employees (N=38) expressed similar sentiments. Fifty-six percent of camp employees also noted the good quality of the instruction, while 40 percent found the courses to be fairly well organized. Forty-six percent (N=31) found the course content to be useful.

Institutions. Most respondents indicated an average level of satisfaction with the quality of course instruction, organization, and usefulness of courses (see S-Table 3). In terms of the assessment measures, employees in all classifications expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with respect to the quality of instruction, while the greatest level of dissatisfaction was attributed to course organization.

Years of Service. Regardless of the length of service, a vast majority of correctional officers, correctional counselors, and MTAs indicated a relatively high level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction (see S-Tables 4 and 5). More specifically, approximately 66 percent of the correctional officers with less than two years of service expressed the greatest level of satisfaction, with 71 percent (N=279) finding instructional quality and 64 percent (N=250) indicating that course organization was good, while 59 percent (N=229) found course content to be useful. Correctional officers with more than two years of service gave mixed reviews in terms of course organization and usefulness of course content. Satisfaction decreased slightly as their years of service increased. While scarcely over 50 percent indicated that course organization and content tended to be good and useful, approximately 25 percent of correctional officers rated the organization of courses as less than average and course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

Similar results were also found for correctional counselors, who found course instruction and organization to be generally good and course content to be useful (see S-Table 4). However, approximately 25 percent of employees with more than 11 years of service expressed more dissatisfaction with all of these measures when compared with other employees with fewer years of service. Correctional counselors rated the instruction and organization as below average or poor and the course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

MTAs also expressed moderate satisfaction with the course instruction, organization, and content (see S-Table 5). Those with less than two years of service indicated the greatest level of satisfaction, with all 21 respondents finding instructional quality to be good or very good. Nineteen respondents (91%) also found course organization to be good to excellent while 17 (81%) found course content to be quite useful. Employee satisfaction decreased with increasing years of service, though overall, it remained rather moderate.

More specifically, seven MTAs with 11 or more years of service (21%) found the quality of instruction to be below average or poor, and 10 MTAs with between two and 10 years of service expressed similar sentiments about instruction. Seven MTAs with six or more years of service found course organization to be below average or poor, and six respondents with more than 11 years of service found the course content to be only somewhat useful. Interestingly, unlike the other employee groups, none of the MTAs found the content of the courses to be a waste of time.

Watches. The data revealed that employees on all three watches were generally satisfied with the quality of instruction, organization, and course content (see S-Table 6). Approximately three-quarters (N=86) of the correctional officers who work varied watches indicated moderate satisfaction with the quality of instruction and two-thirds (N=76) expressed moderate satisfaction with course organization. Sixty-three correctional officers who worked varied watches also indicated that the course content was useful.

The data showed similar results for correctional counselors (see S-Table 6). Correctional counselors who worked second watch expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with

instruction, organization, and usefulness of course content. However, the majority of respondents were on second watch. The responses from MTAs indicated that those who worked third watch expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with instructional quality, organization, and course content (see S-Table 7).

An analysis of the specific watches does reveal several differences, however. For example, 45 MTAs on third watch (96%) indicated that the instructional quality was good or very good, while 40 (85%) rated course organization to be good or excellent and considered course content to be quite useful. In contrast, those who worked the first watch expressed the lowest levels of satisfaction on two of the three measures. Five MTAs who worked first watch (42%) rated instructional quality as below average or poor and three found course content to only be somewhat useful. Thirteen MTAs working second watch (20%) rated course organization as fair or poor.

Camps. Most correctional officers indicated an average level of satisfaction with the quality of course instruction, organization, and usefulness of courses (see S-Table 8), though the overall level of satisfaction appears to be proportionately less than that of employees in CDC institutions (see S-Table 3). In terms of the assessment measures, employees in all classifications expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with respect to the quality of instruction, while the greatest level of dissatisfaction could be attributed to the organization of training. Of the 68 camp employees who responded, 19 found training organization to be only fair or poor. In addition, nine did not find course material to be useful at all.

Regardless of the length of their service, a vast majority of correctional officers indicated moderate satisfaction with the quality of instruction, organization, and usefulness or course content (see S-Table 9). Forty-nine employees had worked more than 11 years and 11 employees had worked between two and 10 years. Most employees indicated the greatest level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction and the least level of satisfaction with course organization.

The data also revealed that employees of all watches were generally satisfied with the quality of instruction, organization, and course content (see S-Table 10), though it is important to keep in mind the low number of respondents. Twenty camp employees worked the third watch and five worked the first watch. Eight employees who worked the third watch indicated the greatest level of satisfaction with instruction and organization, while nearly all of those who worked the first watch were the most satisfied with the usefulness of the course content.

The data show that those with varied watches were most satisfied with the quality of instruction, organization, and course content. However, seven employees indicated that course organization was either fair or poor. Interestingly, those who worked the second watch indicated the greatest level of dissatisfaction with all of the assessment measures. For example, six employees found the course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

Specific Assessment of 7(k) Training Areas

Institutions. Turning now to the specific training areas, respondents were asked to share their perceptions of 7(k) training and to rate each training area. Most correctional officers, correctional counselors, and MTAs indicated a fair level of satisfaction with instruction, organization, and usefulness of all the courses. Firearms and use of force received the most favorable views, with an average of 80 percent of employees finding these courses to be good to excellent across all measures (N=1,950 firearms; N=1,400 use of force) (see S-Tables 11a &b). In general, organization and course content were received less favorably than instructional quality with respect to all training areas. In addition to firearms and use of force, other courses that were particularly useful include health and safety procedures.

Most employees were least satisfied with legal training (e.g., *Clark, Armstrong)* and casework. The quality of instruction (legal, N=878, 20%; casework, N=1,107, 29%) and organization of courses in these areas was below average or poor (N=1,221, 30% for legal: N=1,392, 36% for casework) and course content was considered to be only somewhat useful

or a waste of time (N=1,389 (32%) for legal; N=1,303 34%) for casework) (see S-Tables 11a & b).

More specific differences between these employee classes emerge when they are examined separately (see S-Table 12a & b and S-Table 13a & b). Among correctional officers and MTAs, the best courses across most measures appear to be firearms, health, safety procedures and use of force options. In terms of firearms training, 93 percent of correctional officers (N=3,315) and 94 percent of MTAs (N=138) indicated that the instructional quality was very good. Eighty-three percent of correctional officers (N=2,930) and MTAs (N=122) felt fairly satisfied with the organization of the course, and 85 percent (N=3,037) of the correctional officers and 124 MTAs (84%) found the course content to be rather useful. These employees also indicated similarly high ratings on all measures for use of force options. Correctional officers also found safety procedures to be beneficial and fairly well organized, while MTAs were very satisfied with the quality of instruction, organization, and content of the health training course.

Both correctional officers and MTAs rated casework extremely low across all measures. For example, among correctional officers, 29 percent (N=869) considered instructional quality to be below average or poor, while approximately 37 percent rated course organization and content as below average (N=1,114 and 1,080, respectively) rated it only somewhat useful or a waste of time (see S-Tables 12a & b). Likewise, among MTAs, almost 25 percent found casework to be below average and only somewhat useful or a waste of time with respect to quality of instruction, organization, and course content (see S-Table 13a & b).

In contrast to correctional officers and MTAs, 107 or 37 percent of the correctional counselors found casework training to be very useful (see S-Tables 12a & b). Additional courses determined to be very useful by over 25 percent of these staff include staff-inmate relations and legal training. These findings are not surprising, since they correspond with the work-related duties correctional counselors fulfill daily.

Overall, ratings of specific training areas did not vary much at all with respect to years of service. Most correctional officers and correctional counselors, regardless of years of service, expressed moderate satisfaction with the instruction, organization, and content of the courses (see S-Tables 14a & b through 17a & b). Over 90 percent of correctional officers rated firearms and use of force courses good or excellent and found the course content to be extremely useful, and between 60 and 80 percent of correctional counselors were generally satisfied with their training across these measures.

Casework and legal training received the lowest levels of satisfaction among correctional officers for all years of service. Regardless of years of service, casework was rated below average or poor for level of instruction by approximately 30 percent of the respondents. Legal training also remained rated as below average or poor between 16 percent and 21 percent across years of service. Correctional officers rated the organization of legal training as fair to poor, with the percent increasing by years of service (<2 years=24%, 11 or more years=32%). Casework organization was consistently rated as fair to poor by over 30 percent for each years of service category. Approximately 34 percent of correctional officers of all years of service also indicated that these courses were only somewhat useful or a waste of time (see S-Tables 14a & b through 17a & b). Approximately 30 percent of correctional counselors with more than two years of training found the casework course content to be extremely useful, though about 30 percent rated this training area fairly low with regard to instructional quality (N=79) and course organization (N=90).

Approximately 90 percent of correctional officers with more than two years of service rated the communications course good or excellent in terms of instructional quality (N=2,781). However, between 20 and 30 percent (N=621) employees with 10 years or less of service considered the course to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time (see S-Tables 15a & b through 17a & b).

Other satisfactory views could be found among 90 percent of correctional officers (N=370) with less than two years of service regarding the instructional quality of the safety procedures course (S-Tables 14a & b). Approximately 70 percent (N=2,204) of these employees with

more than two years of service found organization of this course to be good or excellent as well. Seventy-seven percent (N=1,543) of correctional officers with between two and 10 years of service found the content of the health course to be very useful (see Tables S-15a & b through 16a & b).

In contrast, inmate control received poor ratings in terms of instructional quality among correctional officers with less than 11 years of service (N=463) and in terms of organization among employees with five or less years of service and more than 11 years of service (N=764). Moreover, over 200 correctional officers with more than 11 years of service considered the content of the inmate control course to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time (see S-Tables 14a & b through 17a & b).

Most correctional counselors with five or less years of service indicated a high level of satisfaction with safety procedures, with more than 80 percent finding instructional quality (N= 19) and course content (N=16) to be both very good and useful (see S-Tables 14a & b through 15a & b). Most of the employees with between six and 10 years of service also rated the instructional quality and content of the staff-inmate relations to be both very good and useful (Quality, N=75, 93%; Content, N=66, 82%) (see S-Tables 16a & b). Organization received lower ratings in both of these training areas. Lastly, those with 11 or more years of service found health training to be very good and useful across all measures (Quality, N=171, 90%; Organization, N=142, 74%; Content, N=150 ,79%) (see S-Tables 17a & b).

Overall, institutional employees of all watches indicated a high level of satisfaction with firearms training and use of force (see S-Tables 18a & b through 21). Approximately 80 percent of respondents considered their training in these areas to be very good and useful. Clearly, these two training areas seemed to be the most favored among most correctional officers and correctional counselors.

Correctional officers' level of satisfaction with other training areas did not vary much among the various watches. Ninety percent of correctional officers who worked the first, second, and third watches expressed a high level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction in

communications (N=2,944). Likewise, between 60 and 70 percent of correctional officers on these watches found the organization (N=2,336) and content (N=2,469) of the safety procedures course to be very good and useful (see S-Tables 18a & b through 20a & b).

Once again, correctional officers were least satisfied with casework and legal training. These views are fairly consistent across all watches and all measures. Twenty-two percent (N=458) of correctional officers who worked the first and second watches found instructional quality of legal training to be below average or poor. One-third (N=694) of those employees indicated that organization of the course was also below average or poor (see S-Tables 18a & b and 19a & b). Correctional officers who worked the third watch also rated the content of the legal training course fairly low, with 30 percent (N=220) finding it not very useful or a waste of time (see S-Tables 20a & b). Lastly, those who worked the first and second watches indicated that course content for legal training was only somewhat useful or a waste of time (1st watch, N=265, 39%; 2nd watch, N=504, 35%) (see S-Tables 18a & b through 19a & b).

Correctional officers who worked the first, second, and third watches also expressed similar levels of dissatisfaction with casework training. Nearly 30 percent (N=820) found instructional quality to be below average or poor, while over one-third also found the organization (N=1,044) and content (N=1,020) of the course to be below average or poor (see S-Tables 18a & b through 20a & b).

Correctional officers who worked the third watch also indicated low levels of satisfaction with the instructional quality and organization of the law enforcement course (see S-Table 20a & b). Twenty percent (N=219) found instructional quality to be below average or poor, and 27 percent (N=293) found organization of the course to be below average or poor as well.

Correctional officers who worked varied watches expressed similar levels of satisfaction with the training when compared with the employees who worked the individual watches (see S-Table 21a & b). Between 85 and 95 percent found the instructional quality, organization, and course content of firearms, use of force, and safety procedures to be very good and useful.

Courses receiving the lowest levels of satisfaction include legal training, law enforcement, and casework.

Among correctional counselors, most employees of all watches favored the firearms training across all measures. Correctional counselors who worked the second watch also indicated a high level of satisfaction with the health course, with most finding the quality of instruction, organization, and course content to be very good and useful. Most correctional counselors indicated a high level of satisfaction with casework in terms of the usefulness of the content, but considered the instructional quality and organization of the course to be below average or poor (see S-Tables 18a & b through 20a & b).

Camps. Overall, camp employees expressed the most favorable views for firearms, use of force, and safety procedures training (see S-Tables 22a & b). In terms of firearms, 94 percent (N=74) indicated that the instructional quality was very good and approximately 80 percent indicated that organization of the course was very good (N=65) and course content was useful (N=63). Use of force received similar ratings. Ninety percent (N=68) found instructional quality and 75 percent employees rated organization to be very good and the course content was useful or extremely useful (N=57 and 56, respectively)(see S-Tables 22a & b). In terms of the safety procedures course, respondents overwhelmingly rated the course as good or very good, and 76 percent (N=59) rated the organization as good/excellent and the course content as useful/very useful.

In contrast, legal training and casework received the lowest levels of satisfaction among camp employees. In terms of both courses, between 25 and 30 percent of camp employees found the instructional quality and organization of the courses to be below average or poor and course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time (see S-Tables 22a & b).

Legal training, law enforcement, and casework generated the lowest levels of satisfaction among correctional officers. Twenty-six percent of respondents found instructional quality of legal training (N=16) and casework (N=14) to be below average or poor and 12 indicated that the instructional quality of law enforcement training was below average or poor as well.

Approximately 20 respondents felt that the organization of all three of these courses was below average or poor. Correctional officers also indicated that the content of the communications (N=13), legal training (N=15), law enforcement (N=13), and casework (N=17) was only somewhat useful or not useful at all (see S-Table 23).

Training Areas That Provided the Best Preparation for Institutional and Camp Employees

Institutional and camp employees were asked to identify which training areas provided the best preparation for assuming the duties of a correctional officer, correctional counselor I, correctional counselor II specialist, firefighter, or medical technical assistant. We used the 11 training areas identified earlier. The respondents evaluated and rated the quality of this preparation according to a variety of factors, including:

- training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills;
- their level of confidence about performing their duties following training;
- how the training schedule impacts their ability to learn the material;
- their preferred learning styles; and
- the impact of particular instructional delivery methods on their ability to learn the material and apply skills.

Training Areas That Most Improved Knowledge and Skills

Respondents were asked to indicate the three training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 24). For both institutional and camp employees, these areas included departmental policies and procedures, firearms, and use of force options. More specifically, approximately 55 percent (N=2,348) of institutional employees indicated that firearms training and use of force options (N=2,256) improved their knowledge and skills, while 34 percent (N=1,434) found department policies and procedures to be most helpful in this endeavor.

These training areas received similar ratings from camp employees (see S-Table 24). Approximately 31 (45%) respondents indicated that departmental policies and procedures, firearms training, and use of force options most improved their knowledge and skills. For

both institutional and camp employees, casework was identified as the least helpful of the training areas. Only six percent (N=257) of institutional employees found it most improved their knowledge and skills, while none of the camp employees found it helpful.

Institutions. The data reveal that correctional officers indicated that training in department policies and procedures, firearms, and use of force options most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 25). Approximately 2,000 officers indicated that firearms and use of force were helpful to that end (57%), while 1,095 respondents found departmental policies and procedures to have been very useful (33%). Only three percent (N=104) of correctional officers identified casework training as improving their knowledge and skills.

Similarly, 46 percent (N=132) of correctional counselors indicated that departmental policies and procedures most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 25). However, correctional counselors rated legal training (N=145) and casework (N=130) to be the other two training areas to have also improved their knowledge and skills. These findings go together the nature of the duties and responsibilities that correctional counselors have in the institutions. For correctional counselors, law enforcement appears to be the training area that least improved their knowledge and skills (N=10, 4%).

Lastly, approximately 45 percent of MTAs indicated that departmental policies and procedures (N=63) and firearms training (N=61) were the two training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills, while one-third of MTAs (N=46) said that health training most improved their knowledge and skills.

The data did not reveal much variation in terms of years of service and the training areas that most improved institutional employees' knowledge and skills (see S-Table 27). Regardless of years of service, approximately 56 percent of correctional officers indicated that firearms (N=1,892) and use of force options (N=1,839) most improved their knowledge and skills, while an average of 33 percent found the same for training on departmental policies and procedures (N=1,074). Casework appears to have improved knowledge and skills the least for correctional officers, regardless of years of service.

Likewise, there was little variation among correctional counselors in terms of training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 27). Regardless of years of service, all correctional counselors indicated that departmental policies and procedures, legal training, and casework most improved their knowledge and skills. However, a closer analysis reveals some differences among employees with different lengths of service. Eight employees, or 50 percent with two to five years of service indicated casework as one of the training areas that most improved knowledge and skills; 34 respondents with six to 10 years of service (43%) and 85 of those with more than 11 years of service (47%) also found this to be the case.

In terms of legal training, approximately 50 percent of counselors (N=103) with more than six years of training indicated that it most improved their knowledge and skills. In contrast, only six respondents with between two and five years of service (36%) found this to be the case for legal training.

Lastly, 45 counselors with between six and 10 years of service (56%) and eight with between two and five years of service (50%) revealed that departmental policies and procedures most improved their knowledge and skills. However, only 42 percent of those with more than 11 years of service (N=76) indicated that this training area improved their knowledge and skills. Inmate control appears to have been one area which least improved knowledge and skills, with about five percent of employees (N=15), across all years of service, finding it to be valuable.

The data did not reveal much variation when looking at whether employee watch influenced one's perception of the training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 28). Correctional officers on all watches once again rated departmental policies and procedures, firearms training, and use of force options to have most improved their knowledge and skills. A more precise analysis of the watches reveals that a vast majority (nearly 60%; N=1,839) of employees, regardless of watch, found firearms to be the most useful in this endeavor.

In terms of departmental policies and procedures, approximately 34 percent of correctional officers (N=1,049) indicated that it most improved their knowledge and skills. Data for the variable watches reveals many similarities with the other three watches; however, with respect to use of force options, only 47 percent (N=57) found this course to have improved knowledge and skills the most, compared with between 54 and 60 percent (N=1,738) for the other three watches.

Data for the correctional counselors shows more variation in terms of watches and training areas that were found to have most improved employees' knowledge and skills (see S-Table 28). Employees of all three watches agreed that departmental polices and procedures was one training area that most improved their knowledge and skills. A closer analysis of the watches reveals a few differences. Five employees who work first watch (63%) found that firearms training, and four employees indicated that use of force options (50%) most improved their knowledge and skills. However, for those employees who work the second watch, legal training (N=129, 53%) and casework (N=113, 46%) most improved their knowledge and skills.

Among MTAs, departmental policies and procedures and firearms training appeared to be the training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills, regardless of their watch (see S-Table29). Four MTAs who work first watch (33%) indicated that legal training, staff-inmate procedures, and safety procedures improved their knowledge and skills, while 40 of those who worked the second and third watches, indicated support for use of force options. Almost 50 percent of the MTAs on third watch (N=22) felt that health training most improved their knowledge and skills.

Camps. The data show that for correctional officers, departmental policies and procedures (N=29, 46%), firearms training (N=31, 49%), and use of force options (N=29, 46%) improved their knowledge and skills the most (see S-Table 26). None of these employees indicated that casework improved their knowledge and skills. Most camp employees have 11 or more years of service. Twenty-four of these respondents indicated that firearms training most improved their knowledge and skills, while 23 expressed the same opinion about

departmental policies and procedures (see S-Table 27). Likewise, 21 respondents (41%) found health training improved their knowledge and skills.

Despite the fact that nearly all of the correctional officers worked the second watch, employees across all watches agreed that firearms training (N=819) and departmental policies and procedures (N=450) most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 30). Over 50 percent of employees who worked the three watches suggested that firearms training most improved their knowledge and skills.

Level of Confidence About Performing Duties

Institutional and camp employees were asked to rate their level of confidence about performing their respective duties after completing 7(k) training (see S-Table 31). Overall, the data indicate a moderate level of confidence among employees with respect to their abilities to perform their duties after completing the 7(k) training.

In the institutions, 39 percent of correctional officers (N=1413), 33 percent of correctional counselor I's (N=97), 42 percent of correctional counselor II specialists (N=8), and 45 percent (N=69) of medical technical assistants indicated they felt very confident or extremely confident that they could perform their duties upon completion of the training. About 30 percent of institutional employees (N=1,328) offered no opinion, or a neutral opinion, regarding their level of confidence about performing their duties.

However, 87 correctional counselor I's (30%) indicated that they only felt somewhat confident or not confident at all about their performance capabilities following training. Additionally, 39 MTAs, 794 correctional officers, and three correctional counselor II specialists felt only somewhat confident and/or not confident at all about their abilities to perform their duties. Four of the eight firefighters felt only somewhat confident with their ability to perform their duties following their training. Two others offered no opinion, and the other two remaining firefighters felt either very confident or extremely confident. Thirty-nine camp correctional officers (56%) indicated that they felt very confident or extremely confident about their abilities to perform their duties upon completing the training.

However, 18 of these employees gave no opinion, or a neutral opinion, about their level of confidence about performance on the job (26%), while 12 (17%) felt only somewhat confident.

Perception of 7(k) Scheduling on Ability to Learn the Material

Institutional and camp employees were asked to give their perceptions of the impact that the 7(k) training schedule had on their ability to learn the material. For the most part, many institutional and camp employees indicated that the training schedule had no impact on their ability to learn the material (see S-Table 32). More specifically, 1700 (46%) institutional correctional officers and 44 (63%) camp correctional officers felt that scheduling did not impact their ability to learn the material. In terms of institutional employees, 144 correctional counselor I's (53%) and 10 correctional counselor II specialists (53%) indicated that the schedule made no impact whatsoever on their ability to learn the material.

Although most of these employees indicated that the training schedule did not have any impact on them, few employees felt that it negatively affected their ability to learn the material. About 12 percent of institutional employees and 10 percent of camp correctional counselors found the training schedule to have a negative impact. Of the institutional employees, 13 percent of correctional officers (N=463) indicated the greatest level of dissatisfaction, though this figure is low. Nine correctional counselor II specialists (47%) felt that the scheduling had a positive impact on their ability to learn the material.

Data were also analyzed regarding the impact of the training schedule on employees' ability to learn the material based on years of service (see S-Table 33). Overall, little variation exists in terms of the length of an employee's service and the impact of the schedule on one's learning. There are, however, some subtle differences.

In terms of institutional employees, 180 correctional officers with less than two years of service (46%) indicated that the schedule had no impact on their learning ability, but 173 said that it had a positive impact (44%). The remaining 32 correctional officers felt negatively about the scheduling (8%). Similar results could be found for correctional officers with

between six and 10 years and those with 11 or more years of service. Three hundred thirty-three officers with between six and 10 years (46%) and 341 with more than 11 years of service (44%) found that the training schedule had no impact on their ability to learn the material. However, 307 and 325 officers in both length of service categories respectively felt that the schedule had a positive impact (42%).

Four hundred ninety-three correctional officers with between two and five years of service (51%) indicated that the schedule had no impact, but 366 said that it had a positive impact on their ability to learn the material (38%). The scheduling seemed to impact 14 percent of the correctional officers with 11 or more years of service (N=105) most negatively, though it is a relatively small figure overall.

Correctional counselors also expressed similarly mixed feelings about the schedule, though due to small numbers, we cannot elaborate on those with five years or less of service. However, forty percent of the counselors with six to 10 years of service noted scheduling had a positive impact. Of those counselors with 11 or more years of service (N=160), half said that the schedule had no impact on their learning. The majority of the camp correctional officers (N=37), regardless of years of service, indicated that the schedule had no impact on their learning.

Data were also collected on institutional and camp employees' perceptions of the training schedule on their ability to learn the material according to their particular watch. Overall, most employees indicated that the schedule had no impact on learning ability, regardless of their watch (see S-Table 34).

A closer examination of the data reveals that, for institutional correctional officers, those who worked the first watch expressed the greatest level of dissatisfaction with the training schedule, with 119 indicating that it negatively affected their ability to learn the material (21%). Despite this finding, 237 officers felt that it had no impact (41%), and 224 felt that the schedule impacted their learning ability in a positive way (39%). Correctional officers who worked varied watches seemed to have the most positive reaction to the training

schedule. Fifty-five officers stated it had no impact (51%) and 47 said it impacted their learning ability positively (44%). Only six officers on these varied watched indicated that the training schedule had a negative impact on their learning ability (6%).

Likewise, those who worked the second and third watches expressed moderate satisfaction with the schedule. Fifty percent (N=463) of those correctional officers who worked the third watch and 48 percent (N=554) of second watch employees felt that the schedule had no impact. Approximately 41 percent of these employees indicated that it had a positive impact on their learning ability (N=853). One hundred thirty second watch correctional officers (11%) and 72 who worked the third watch felt that the schedule had a negative impact on their ability to learn the material (8%).

Correctional counselors on nearly all of the watches expressed much more positive reactions to the training schedule. For example, four of the six correctional counselors on the third watch and the single employee who worked a varied watch indicated that the training schedule impacted their ability to learn the material in a positive manner. Four correctional counselors who worked the first watch felt that the schedule had no impact and three saw a positive impact on their learning ability. Those correctional counselors who worked the second watch expressed the greatest level of dissatisfaction with the training schedule, with 25 (12%) indicating that it had a negative impact on their ability to learn the material. Forty-eight percent (N=115) felt it had no impact, while 40 percent (N=77) said it had a positive impact on their learning.

Camp correctional officers also showed moderate satisfaction with the training schedule. For example, four of the five employees who worked the first watch felt that the schedule had a positive impact, while only one employee said it had no impact. Those working second, third, and varied watches had similar perceptions about the training schedule and its impact on their ability to learn the material. Most indicated (N=36) that the schedule had no effect on their learning.

Learning Style and Preferred Delivery Method for Training

Institutional and camp employees were also asked to indicate their preferred learning style (see S-Table 35). Learning styles included video, lectures, discussions, and hands-on. The most favored learning styles were hands-on, video, and discussion. However, employees overwhelmingly indicated that they preferred a hands-on approach to learn the material.

Among institutional employees, 37 percent (N=1,361) of correctional officers, 36 percent (N=105) of correctional counselor I's, and 31 percent (N=47) of medical technical assistants indicated that they preferred a hands-on approach, while eight correctional counselor II specialists (42%) preferred videos. There did not appear to be clear support for any one particular learning style among firefighters, though none of these employees preferred the lecture learning style. In fact, for all institutional employees, the lecture learning style received the lowest level of support. Among camp correctional officers, 44 percent (N=31) favored a hands-on approach; videos also appeared to be a preferred learning style with 33 percent (N=23) indicating support for this style of learning.

Institutional and camp employees were queried about the delivery methods that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 36) and to also indicate the level of usefulness of these methods in terms of their ability to learn the material and apply skills (see S-Table 37). Eleven delivery methods were identified. These methods included lecture, PowerPoint, video training tapes, scenarios, group work, demonstrations, role play/hands-on, handouts, open discussion, personal experience, and other (i.e., respondent identified method).

Overwhelmingly, video training tapes, scenarios, demonstrations, and open discussion were the most favored delivery methods among these employees (see S-Table 36). In addition, institutional and camp employees also indicated that all delivery methods were generally useful in terms of helping them learn the material and apply skills, but video training tapes, scenarios, and open discussion were the most useful delivery methods (see S-Table 37). For purposes of clarity, the data for institutional and camp employees will be considered separately below.

Institutions. The data indicate that institutional employees found that video training tapes, scenarios, and demonstrations improved their ability to learn the training material (see S-Table 36). Scenarios appeared to be the most helpful delivery method for these employees (N=2,136), while 45 percent (N=1,880) learned material best from videos and 42 percent (N=1,764) learned best from demonstrations. It is interesting to note that, in terms of usefulness, video training tape training was not among the top rated delivery methods. However, it was considered a very useful teaching method among these employees in terms of helping them learn the material (N=3,465) and apply skills (N=3,020) (see S-Table 37).

Demonstrations and scenarios proved to be the most useful in terms of learning material (N=3,842 and 3,765 respectively) for approximately 85 percent of institutional employees and for 75 percent of these employees in terms of applying skills (N=3,369 benefited from demonstrations and 3,315 from scenarios) (see S-Table 37). Additionally, institutional employees also rated open discussions as either a useful or a very useful method to help them learn the material (N=3,656, 81%) and apply the skills (N=3,169, 70%). Incidentally, the least useful delivery method appeared to be handouts. Forty percent (N=1,785) of employees considered handouts either to be only somewhat useful or not useful at all in terms of helping them learn the material, while 34 percent (N=1,534) felt handouts did not really help them to apply the skills learned in the training.

When asked which three delivery methods most improved their ability to learn the material and apply the skills, the three primary and preferred teaching delivery methods identified above were again indicated by the respondents: video training tapes, scenarios, and demonstrations (see S-Tables 38 and 39). Demonstrations, scenarios, open discussion, and role play/hands-on learning, seemed to be the most useful to these employees in terms of learning the material and applying skills (see S-Tables 40a and b and 41).

More specifically, 52 percent (N=1,700) correctional officers and correctional counselors (N=150) indicated that scenarios most improved their ability to learn the material and apply skills (see S-Table 38). About 85 percent of both employee groups indicated that scenarios

are useful or very useful in delivering the material to them, while approximately 70 percent rated this method fairly high in terms of skill application (see S-Table 40b).

Demonstrations also appeared to be favored among 41 percent (N=118) of the correctional counselors and 42 percent of correctional officers (N=1,400) and MTAs (N=57) (see S-Tables 38 and 39). In terms of enabling employees to learn the material, demonstrations were also a useful or very useful delivery method among 85 percent of correctional officers (N=2,987), 87 percent (N=254) of correctional counselors, and 90 percent (N=131) of MTAs (see S-Tables 40a & b and 41). This delivery method also earned high ratings from these employees when skill application was considered. Seventy-six percent of correctional officers (N=2,654), 72 percent of correctional counselors (N=208), and 75 percent (N=109) of MTAs all indicated that demonstrations were useful or very useful in this endeavor. Interestingly, videotape training also improved employees' learning and skill application a great deal, though it was not considered to be the one of the most useful delivery method by any of these employee groups. This delivery method was highly favored among 46 percent (N=1,525) of correctional officers, 35 percent (N=100) of correctional counselors, and 49 percent (N=66) of MTAs (see S-Table 38).

However, the data reveal that open discussion appears to one of the most useful delivery methods among correctional officers, correctional counselors, and MTAs while role play, or hands-on learning, was rated quite high in terms of usefulness among MTAs (see S-Tables 40a & b and Table 41). More specifically, approximately 80 percent of both correctional officers (N=2,832) and correctional counselors (N=242), and 88 percent (N=128) of MTAs found open discussion to be useful or very useful in helping them learn the material. Regarding skill application, 70 percent (N=2,483) of correctional officers, 64 percent (N=191) of correctional counselors, and 74 percent (N=107) of MTAs also rated the usefulness of this delivery method high.

MTAs expressed a moderately high level of satisfaction with role-play, or hands-on learning, as a delivery method both in terms of its ability to help respondents learn the material and apply skills (see S-Table 41). Eighty-six percent (N=124) considered this delivery method

useful or very useful with respect to learning the material, while 74 percent (N=107) rated this method in the same manner regarding skill application.

The use of handouts appeared to be the least helpful to eight percent (N=266) of correctional officers and nine MTAs, while group work was identified as the least helpful delivery method among nine percent (N=27) of correctional counselors. Handouts were not considered very useful at all among these employees; approximately one-third indicated that handouts were only somewhat useful or not useful at all in terms of both learning the material and applying the skills (see S-Tables 40a & b and Table 41).

Camps. Like institutional employees, camp employees also felt that video training tapes, scenarios, and demonstrations improved their ability to learn the material and apply skills, although they also rated open discussion and handouts fairly high (see S-Table 36). More specifically, 58 percent (N=41) of camp employees supported the use of videos, while 34 percent (N=24) said that scenarios, demonstrations, and handouts improved their learning. Open discussion appeared to be a helpful delivery method for camp employees (N=26, 37%). Incidentally, only 11 percent (N=455) of institutional employees felt they learned best from handouts, while PowerPoint appeared to be the least effective delivery method among camp employees, with only one employee preferring this method to most of the others.

Fifty-nine percent (N=38) of correctional officers indicated that video training tapes most improved their ability to learn the material and apply skills (see S-Table 39). An average of 37 percent maintained that demonstrations (N=23) and open discussion (N=24) also improved their learning ability and skill application. However, in terms of the usefulness of particular delivery methods, these employees indicated that demonstrations, open discussion, and group work were the most beneficial for learning the material and applying skills (see S-Table 42). More specifically, 87 percent (N=54) of employees rated demonstrations useful or very useful with respect to learning the material and skill application. Approximately 85 percent (N=47) rated group work and open discussions in this manner.

Correctional officers considered the use of PowerPoint and handouts to be the least useful delivery methods; 29 percent felt that these methods were only somewhat useful or not useful at all with respect to assisting them in the learning process (N=29) or with skill application (N=25) (sees S-Table 42).

Improvement of 7(k) Training Over the Preceding Six Months

Both institutional and camp employees were asked if the quality and usefulness of 7(k) training improved during the last six months (see S-Table 43). Approximately 63 percent of institutional correctional officers, correctional counselor II specialists, firefighters, and MTAs indicated that the training did, in fact, improve over the preceding six months. However, 51 percent of correctional counselor I's felt that 7(k) did not improve over the last six months.

The data reveal few differences among camp correctional officers regarding recent improvement in training (see S-Table 43). While 36 correctional officers indicated that it did improve, an almost equal number (N=32) felt that it did not get any better. Therefore, for camp employees, it remains difficult to say conclusively one way or another whether 7(k) actually improved during this time period.

A closer analysis of the length of service was done to see if it played a role in employees' perceptions of the improvement of 7(k) (see S-Table 44). Overall, few differences existed among those employees with varying years of service in terms of their perception of recent improvements in training. Employees were pretty equally split between those who saw improvement and those who did not see improvement over the last six months.

On-the-Job Training

We asked whether institutional and camp employees had any on-the job training (OJT) within the past year and, if so, to indicate whether it helped them perform their duties more effectively. From 74 percent (correctional counselor II specialist) to 100 percent (firefighters) of institutional employees have had OJT (N=3,347) (see S-Table 45), and all classifications felt that OJT helped them perform their duties better (N=2,922) (see S-Table

46). However, 26 percent of correctional counselor II specialists (N=5) were not provided any OJT and 12 percent (N=350) of institutional correctional officers who had OJT felt that it did not help their job performance. Likewise, 60 camp correctional officers (86%) had OJT and 55 officers (92%) indicated that it helped them to perform their duties more effectively.

Overall Impressions of 7(k) Training and Recommendations for Improvement

Institutional and camp correctional officers, correctional counselors, medical technical assistants, and firefighters were asked to write any comments about their overall impression of 7(k) training. Given the vast range of responses, we classified respondents' impressions into 14 categories that represent the general intent of the individual responses:

- Great: impressive, has improved much, better than old method, very useful/helpful/good, I like it;
- Useful: good review/update, applies to job, helps meet mandatory requirements, good material, needed, helpful;
- Generally okay training: fine, fair, good, satisfactory, improving;
- Instructor quality: poor instructors, instructor influence on class, need better qualified instructors;
- Great!: instructors' name provided, rave reviews;
- Repetitive: same material over and over, need new and broader range of materials;
- General dissatisfaction: waste of time, do not like it, it's boring, trying to nullify liability, not worth 5 percent extra pay, get rid of it, do not want to be there;
- Information not relevant: doesn't apply, needs to be updated and expanded, conflicts with other information;
- Class length: too long, break into two 2-hour blocks, trainers struggle to fill 4 hours, too short/need more;
- Training schedule: takes away from family, fatigue, hard after first watch, class frequency/times, do not like extra hours;
- Preferred training schedule: should be held during regular work hours;
- Recommended teaching techniques: more hands-on, videos, scenarios, make fun/interesting, return to block training, more on-the-job training, identified training preferences;

- General comments: others make it difficult to learn, bad class environment, difficult in camp setting, quality varies; and

Institutional Correctional Peace Officers. ***Overall Impressions***. Approximately 35 percent of the responding correctional peace officers commented that the training was great and useful, while another 21 percent indicated they were generally okay with the 7(k) training. Many saw it as an effective means of gaining useful knowledge, meeting mandatory training requirements, keeping skills sharp, and maintaining currency on departmental policies and procedures. Those who expressed satisfaction with the 7(k) training stated that it improved employee performance because it provided the opportunity to feel more confident in making decisions, complemented work assignments and allowed them to learn their job. Others identified specific courses that were particularly useful – firearms, chemical agents, baton, use of force, and drug identification.

Table 3. Coded Comments of Impressions by CDC Correctional Peace Officers

Coded Comments of Impressions	Number	Percent
Generally ok training	692	20.5
Useful	667	19.7
General dissatisfaction	533	15.8
Great	514	15.2
Information not relevant	343	10.1
Repetitive	280	8.3
Recommended teaching techniques	273	8.1
Training schedule	218	6.4
General comments	216	6.4
Instructor quality	154	4.6
Class length	156	4.6
Great!	88	2.6
Should be during regular hours	84	2.5

Note: More than one response possible

There were 88 respondents who made positive general comments about the instructors and/or remarks about specific instructors: “Sgt. B. turns his classes into learning sessions by using his teaching skills. You are appreciated”; “Sgt. F. is really good,” and “Sgt. B. is the reason 7(k) is the quality training we need and depend on and B is doing such a great job, he should be given his own parking spot.” General comments included that the instructors were excellent or good because of their ability to interact with the class, sometimes in spite of the fact that the material was dull, limited and/or outdated.

Respondents' dissatisfaction (approximately 38%) with 7(k) training was represented by those who indicated it was a waste of time, saw no purpose to the training, questioned the relevance of the training topics, commented on the repetitive nature of much of the training, and identified problems with class length, class schedule and the use of inexperienced and/or untrained instructors. Those who reported being generally dissatisfied with the training, which represented approximately 16 percent of the respondents, suggested we do away with 7(k), stated it was a waste of time and money, and no one would miss it if it were eliminated. The impression was that these respondents saw no value at all to the training, particularly because of the training schedule.

When looking specifically at the comments made by 260 responding correctional counselors, over one-third expressed general dissatisfaction with 7(k) training and indicated that the training wasn't relevant. Twenty percent of the respondents did however, find 7(k) training great and/or useful. Among the 131 responding medical technical assistants, over one-third stated that the training was great and/or useful. Seventeen percent of these respondents expressed general dissatisfaction with 7(k), including concerns with the relevance of the information, as applied to targeted classification groups.

The correctional officers who commented on the lack of relevancy of the training (7%) saw little if any application of the knowledge, skills and abilities obtained to their daily work activities. Another 7 percent stated that the same material was offered over and over again ("using stone age materials") and there was a need for more up-to-date material covering a wider range of subject matter. Several officers also noted that supervisors needed training; with 7(k), correctional officers were better trained than their supervisors, which limited the latter's ability to remediate or provide OJT to line staff.

Correctional officers (9%) who commented on the training schedule and class length were generally concerned with the additional four hours of training after an 8-hour shift, especially for those coming off the first watch that runs from about 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. They commented that the schedule affects retention and learning, poses problems of fatigue and lost family time, and would be better offered on state time. Others specifically stated that

four hours of training was too long, that oftentimes the instructor would fill the time with irrelevant material or provide long breaks, and that the training would be more effective if offered in 2-hour training blocks.

Approximately four percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the instructor pool, noting some were unqualified, lacked the experience necessary to train, and were boring. Several comments illustrate this concern: "A lot depends on who gives the class. A good instructor makes the class useful. A bad instructor makes the class worthless and boring," "Classes are either very interesting and useful or very boring and long, depending on who is teaching the class," and "The instructor is the key to the quality of the training." Several respondents did not like the classes where the instructor read verbatim from the lesson plan, provided a handout that is also read verbatim ("we already know how to read ourselves"), or allowed the class to discuss irrelevant issues in order to fill the time. They saw a need for better-trained and qualified instructors.

A number of officers were concerned that others make it difficult for those who want to learn. A number had experienced bad class environments, and as one indicated, " 90 percent of the participants do not listen or care." These occurrences created situations and environments that were not conducive to learning, contributing to a general dissatisfaction with the training. Of the six percent of the responding officers who made these general comments, a number stated that the variable quality of the instruction and the course material also contributed to their unhappiness with 7(k).

Recommendations. Respondents made several suggestions that in their opinion would improve 7(k) training. These recommendations include:

- more hands-on training, including practice (e.g., drills) and demonstration time;
- include use of scenarios for training;
- conduct some training within the institution (e.g., alarm response);
- offer training within 8-hour workday;
- use the on-the-job training format for the delivery of some of the training;
- conduct more site and job specific training; and

- use more videos (that illustrate and discuss correct response).

Other recommendations included better and more knowledgeable instructors (and guest speakers and other specialists), updated materials, and creation of a wider scope of topics in order to alleviate repetition and to better inform participants. In addition, respondents suggested:

- offering 1-hour classes, four days a week, or 2-hour training blocks, twice a month;
- allowing for group interaction and time for course and instructor evaluation;
- training in designated, well-equipped classrooms;
- setting standards for class curriculum and instructor training; and
- including supervisors in the 7(k) program to ensure their growth as well as enhance their ability to provide guidance.

Table 4. Coded Comments of Recommendations Made by CDC Correctional Peace Officers

Coded Comments of Recommendations	Number	Percent
More subjects	376	13.2
More hands on	339	11.9
Better instructors	324	11.4
Update materials/make relevant	276	9.7
More videos	214	7.5
Drop it	197	6.9
Miscellaneous	196	6.9
Make relevant	194	6.8
Flexibility/schedule	172	6.0
Needs more discussion/participation	167	5.9
During regular hours	164	5.8
Less training time	150	5.3
Training split-up	101	3.5
Block training	79	2.8
Fine now, useful	79	2.8
Better facilities	76	2.7
OJT	75	2.6
Make it interesting/fun	33	1.2
Scenarios	27	0.9
Standardize	7	0.2

Note: More than one response possible

As can be seen in Table 4, approximately 7 percent (N=197) who responded to this open-ended question also recommended that 7(k) be dropped and another 5 percent requested less training time. Finally, 172 respondents (6%) wanted more flexibility in scheduling (e.g., officer choose class and more leeway for make-ups) and another 164 respondents (6%) wanted the training to be conducted during regular work hours.

Camp Employees. ***Overall Impressions***. There were approximately 66 respondents from the camps. The camp setting is quite unique and differs from that of an institution, particularly during fire season. In some cases, there are few hours during the day when a number of 7(k) correctional officers are together. A number of respondents indicated that the 7(k) training was good and useful. They stated that 7(k) training kept employees current on policies and procedures in the department, served as good refresher training, and provided a vehicle for training to occur at all.

However, more often than not, camp correctional employees expressed frustration and dislike for the training, especially during fire season. Specific comments included:

- Difficult to maintain consistent training program in a camp setting (e.g., due to lack of staff, odd hours, remoteness of camp, fires and floods);
- Doesn't work at camps unless training videos are produced and made available for viewing at all hours;
- Better if training incorporated more camp operational procedures;
- Due to limited number of staff at camp, no way you can offer formal 7(k) training and therefore staff are forced to get their training from handouts;
- During fire season, hard to work the additional 4 hours of 7(k) that are pre and post work activity time for posted employees only; and
- Training should be on state time (i.e., during 8-hour work shift).

A number of respondents stated that they do not like to stay the additional four hours, especially after first watch. They wanted to see better training materials and better organization of the training.

Recommendations. Over 25 percent of the 58 respondents listing recommendations stated that we should do away with 7(k). Other recommendations included conducting an 8-hour training module; using more hands-on, scenarios, open discussions, lesson plans, PowerPoint and videos; conducting classes off-site and allowing college courses in criminal justice to be counted as 7(k); using the OJT model for 7(k); and providing more qualified instructors. Two respondents suggested having camps train together so that one could compare the level

of training and expertise and discuss situations pertinent to job requirements in a camp setting. Several other officers recommended that the institutional IST office that oversees the camps (i.e., California Correctional Center and Sierra Conservation Center) provide the materials and training for the camps.

CDC Correctional Counselor I and Correctional Counselor II Specialist Focus Group Interview

Researchers had the opportunity to conduct a focus group interview with correctional counselor I and correctional counselor II specialists at one institution (see Appendix 2 for the structure of the interviews). There were approximately 25 participants in the interview. When asked to say the first word or words that came into their mind when the researcher said 7(k), many stated that they "hated it," "4 hours," "why," and "a waste of time, especially when you have to sit in a classroom for four hours."

Respondents were asked what training they received as part of 7(k) and what they thought about this training. An employee from one center in the institution stated that they had received no training for almost two years and were just required to work an additional two hours a week to meet the 168-hour requirement for the work period. Others expressed frustration with the training they received because it was the same material, over and over again. They indicated that their supervisors just rotated the same training every couple of months. In addition, the training was focused on correctional officer duties, not correctional counselor responsibilities.

When asked how this training affected their work performance, respondents said that it had no positive impact on their work. Supervisors were unable to provide adequate training, in part because of the instability in that employee class within the institution. Sometimes, correctional counselor I's would be assigned as 'acting' supervisor and provide whatever training they deemed appropriate.

Most respondents would like to get rid of 7(k). They do not like the 4-hour classroom setting for training, the use of the same outdated lesson plans, and the requirement that they work an

additional four hours every 28-day work period because they are not provided with the pre and post work activity time afforded the correctional officer. Several recommendations were suggested for 7(k) training:

- Make training available on the unit;
- Offer training in a more informal structure, using the OJT format;
- Allow classification and parole representative training, which is offered monthly, to satisfy 2 ½ hours of the 4-hour mandate;
- Allow the 4-hours a month for pre and post work activity time to apply to all correctional peace officers, not just those on posted positions;
- Establish 1-and 2-hour training increments;
- Standardize correctional counselor training in the units – provide supervisors with lesson plans;
- Allow briefings and updates on policies and procedures to meet training requirement;
- Design training that is more relevant to the work responsibilities of correctional counselors (e.g., classification); and
- Conduct 7(k) training during regular work hours.

Participants indicated that shorter time increments and relevant training offered on the units would have a positive impact on their work performance. In addition, providing the four hour pre and post work activity time (i.e., walk time) to all correctional peace officers recognizes that all of these employees have to gather their respective 'tools of the trade' before beginning their workday. Correctional counselors get their pepper spray, alarm and files before proceeding to their unit, while correctional officers get their pepper spray, alarm, baton and cuffs before they proceed to their unit or yard.

CDC Sergeants' and Lieutenants' Focus Group Interviews

Three focus group interview sessions, two with approximately 20 sergeants per session and one with approximately 20 lieutenants, were conducted in June and July 2001 during their respective academies at the training center. Our purpose was to gain additional insight into the 7(k) training program and on-the-job training in CDC. Participants were invited to respond freely and openly to several questions posed by the facilitator, and were assured that

their individual comments would remain confidential though they would be collectively summarized (see Appendix 2 for the focus group structure).

The interviews began with an opening exercise where each participant was given a three-by-five note card and asked to write down a one-word or very brief description of what the term "7(k) training" means to him/her. Participants were then asked to read their comments to the group. Responses varied, though the majority of comments centered on four main themes:

- *Perception that 7(k) was not implemented as intended*: Participants stated that there was no direction provided by the department nor was curriculum provided to the individual institutions. "It was a good concept and employees would prefer good/practical training that relates to what they do, but it didn't happen." Oftentimes the training process was very disorganized.
- *Training was redundant*: Several supervisors indicated that because of the lack of curriculum, training staff used the same old material over and over again. Several participants indicated it was "a waste of time," "boring," "useless," and "repetitive." Others commented that the topics were not stimulating.
- *Lack of quality training*: Institutions were making things up to fill the classes. One participant indicated that 7(k) consisted of a walking tour of the institution, while another stated that they were given a 'handwriting' class as their training. Others said that most of the training was neither stimulating nor useful, which led to a general displeasure with the training.
- *It's about money, not training*: One comment was that, "The focus is on money, not on becoming better trained and doing one's job better."

There were numerous comments made about the useless nature of much of the training. The example was given of two classes (e.g., bloodborne pathogens, sexual harassment) that were offered every other month at one institution. The participants suggested that this occurred because of the fact that the IST office had to ensure that all employees were current with their mandatory requirements. Thus, those who were in compliance were completely bored with the same training, time and time again.

Participants were asked to share their perception of employee satisfaction with 7(k) training. The most frequent comment made was that the officers did not like working a 12-hour day. The long day had the biggest effect on those officers coming off first watch, who had to stay awake for an additional four hours. A secondary concern was working a long day for straight pay. In the past, training was offered during the workday and officers were given overtime if they stayed beyond their shift. Commenting on this point, one supervisor said: "Any time you ask employees to stay longer, whether two or four hours, they do not like it without overtime pay."

The participants also commented that employees tend to wait until the end of the 28-day work period to attend training, which is consistent with the observations made by the IST managers and sergeants. After the agreement was revised to allow correctional employees to attend training at their convenience rather than on their designated training day, the pattern has been to wait until the last minute and hope there is room in the class.

When asked how the training affected employee performance, participants expressed frustration that there was no discernable improvement in employee performance. In fact, they indicated that employees expressed considerable sarcasm and complaints about their 7(k) training. As one participant noted, "I don't know if there is a way to save 7(k) because employees are too disgruntled." Yet, if this training is to stay, most agreed that the instructor was the key. "It is not effective to just grab a 'supervisor,' hand him/her a lesson plan and ask them to teach the class." It results in poor instruction.

Several participants were concerned with the use of correctional officers as trainers; the concern is whether the officer can gain the respect of his/her peers and control the class. A related concern is the effect this situation has on the participants' ability to learn the material. In another session, however, several participants indicated that using a 7(k) correctional officer as an instructor could be great, but only if that person had subject-matter expertise and was adequately trained as a trainer.

Participants were queried about what OJT was offered to employees. It was clear that the key to effective OJT was the supervisor: "If the supervisor could increase the confidence of the employee and provide him/her with the knowledge and skills to do their job, it was great." The consensus was that while OJT was probably not uniform among the institutions, and in some cases it probably meant nothing, it was used for remediation and to address issues unique to the unit. Some institutions put quizzes at the back of their bulletins; employees completing the quiz and submitting it to the training office receive OJT credit. Several participants did not see this as real OJT: "What we're doing is not getting them positively motivated." The OJT most preferred by employees was that offered in their work area because it was on-site (e.g., in their unit, dorm or yard), hands-on, done during working hours and had direct relevance to their work responsibilities.

Staff from those institutions with a particular housing setting (e.g., level 4's, not dormitory settings) and support by the warden to close yards for training indicated that their ability to offer quality training was enhanced, particularly in such training areas as alarm response. Other participants felt that it was almost impossible to gauge the impact of OJT on employee performance.

The sergeants and lieutenants offered three suggestions for improving OJT:

- Develop departmental policies and procedures for institutions to close yards/units to offer OJT;
- Encourage institutions to allow for short briefings prior to one's shift; and
- Train supervisors so they are better able to provide OJT and are fully aware of the specific training (e.g., procedures for cell extractions) offered to their employees.

On-the-job training is discussed in more depth on page 137.

They also made the following recommendations for improving 7(k) training:

- Standardize training, both in terms of content and scheduling statewide. Have the Department take responsibility for developing the curriculum, recognizing the

uniqueness of each institution and camp and allowing for some local variability in terms of some of the content (e.g., use of scenarios).

- Conduct employee needs assessment; they are on the line and have the best knowledge regarding training needs.
- Examine the potential for 15-30 minute briefing before shift where employees meet in a designated area. The time for this briefing would be included in the 52-hour 7(k) requirement. The advantage of this briefing time is that it could be done just before shift and address issues of immediate relevance to the officers.
- Develop policies and procedures for shutting down programs for training, regardless of institution type. This could be for a short period (e.g., one hour) or a 4-hour block.
- Consider an alternative training schedule; eliminate one day a week from the regular day off schedule (e.g., Wednesday) and do training on each shift; offer 7(k) training every three months; or schedule 8-hour training blocks.
- Offer some team teaching, using supervisors and officers.
- Review curriculum to determine appropriate class length. Several participants commented that it appeared that a time length was selected and curriculum was designed to meet that time period.
- Develop more proficiency and competency tests.
- Use more hands-on training, including practice-type classes and scenarios.
- Create a stronger and more qualified pool of instructors, with subject-matter expertise.
- Add a correctional training officer position in each institution. This person could offer training classes, provide training in the units/dorms/yards, and provide mentoring to the new correctional officers by allowing the new recruits to follow him/her around to learn how to perform their job.
- Provide each institution with the Range 2000 equipment. The scenarios and practice opportunities inherent in Range 2000 will allow for training in such areas as communication skills, cell extraction and searches.
- Clarify CPOST rule that lesson plans must be read verbatim. Allow instructors some flexibility to summarize material while ensuring that key points are addressed.

Many of the recommendations suggested by these participants are similar to those made by the IST managers, sergeants and 7(k) sergeants. An additional training position, more hands-on classes, standardized curriculum with local flexibility, stronger instructor pools, use of more informal (i.e., briefings) or OJT training model and the availability of Range 2000 were all emphasized in our in-person interviews and focus group interviews.

Finally, several participants stated that briefings could also be used to keep staff informed about current situations and minimize the rumors and misunderstandings that currently characterize the manner in which some information is shared with the line staff. CDC Special Services Unit could write a briefing, which after departmental approval, could be forwarded to the institutions to be shared with all custody and non-custody staff.

7(k) Training Course Scheduling and Offerings in Parole Regions

The training officers from each of the four parole regions provided 7(k) training information in various formats. The coverage period was generally for the work periods beginning in January 1999 and extending through the end of 2000. The data included sign-in sheets, any available memoranda and lesson plan cover sheets, and training announcements. It was not feasible to accurately or statistically compute the number of sessions offered, the number of participants by course, or the class length. Thus, the following will provide a summary analysis of the information. It should be noted that parole agents are required to complete 92 hours of training annually – 52 hours of 7(k) training and 40 hours of mandated training. According to several training coordinators, the mandated training (e.g., defensive tactics, firearms) are included in the 40 hours, not the 7(k) program.

Course Scheduling

Parole regions I and II administrators sent similar memos to district administrators, unit and subunit supervisors, and training coordinators which stated that the Unit 6 MOU 7(k) agreement requires 52 hours of training annually. The responsibility for training was to rotate from unit, to district, and then to the regional office.

The unit training is the responsibility of the unit supervisor, held on-site (Regions I and II) or off-site (Region I) at the supervisor's discretion. It is designed to address issues relevant to the unit's operation and local needs. The district training is the responsibility of the district administrator and should be held at a central site and include any travel time needed in the 4-hour block. It is often necessary to schedule multiple sessions to ensure adequate office coverage. The topics include issues relevant to the whole district.

The regional training is the responsibility of the regional training coordinator and should address division-wide policy and operational needs. Three to four selected training sites across the regions are used to deliver the training. According to the training coordinators, the region does most of the mandated training for the parole agents. In Region I, training staff at all levels were encouraged to identify and utilize trainers with T-4-T certification, teaching certificates and/or subject-matter experts.

In Region III, the regional office conducts the mandatory training (with four regional training coordinators) with parole agent III's (i.e., supervisors) responsible for providing four hours of related job training to the agents in their respective offices/units. Sometimes the unit uses the staff meeting for 7(k) training. The district is not responsible for providing training in this region. In Region IV, the unit supervisor sets up 7(k) training and maintains data on its training. As in Region III, the staff meeting is used to offer 7(k).

Course Offerings

The data reviewed from sign-in sheets, agendas and minutes provided by the regions indicate that training is provided in 12 broad categories (see Chart 3 in Appendix 4). It should be noted that some of the training listed below, based on conversations with the regional training coordinators, is mandatory and thus should not be included within the 52 hours of 7(k) training. Thus, the cautionary note made earlier about the accuracy of the data must be taken into account when reviewing this information.

The following lists the training areas and includes examples of the specific types of training offered:

- Supervision of parolees: family violence; cash assistance policies and procedures; field supervision; and defensive tactics.
- Case decision-making: substance abuse treatment; parolee outpatient clinic; dual diagnosis; and drug abuse recognition.
- Communication: interview techniques; courtroom skills and tactics; and parolee violation report writing.
- Investigations: offender based information systems; crime scene preservation; interim parolee tracking system; and parolees as informants.
- Arrests: tactical entry; parole searches (Reyes); parolee at large policy; and vehicle stops.
- Departmental: sexual harassment; violence in the workplace; officer of the day; and stress management.
- Legal: *Clark*; *Armstrong*; sex offender registration; and child victimization and reporting.
- Community resource presentations: child protective services; Employment Development Department; Atascadero programs; and jail operations.
- Weapons/firearms: division firearm familiarity; weapons safety; chemical exposure; and quarterly qualifications.
- Health: bloodborne pathogens; first aid/CPR; injury illness prevention program; and TB.
- Safety: vehicle safety; use of fire extinguisher; self-defense; and emergency preparedness.
- Interagency activities/meetings: local program review and SWEEPs.
- Other: bomb threats; peer audits; REAP programs; and inmate-staff relations.

Overall, the data suggest that there are a wide range of courses and training offered statewide under the 7(k) training umbrella.

Regional Parole Training Coordinators' Perception Of 7(k) Training From Interviews

The four regional training coordinators were asked similar questions regarding the 7(k) program to those asked of the institutional training managers and 7(k) sergeants. The areas of inquiry included implementation of the 7(k) training program, course selection and scheduling, program impact on employee performance, usefulness of the training tracking system, and overall impressions of and recommendations for the 7(k) training program.

The agreement required 52 hours of training annually with scheduling by management. This arrangement provided the parole regions with the flexibility to offer training beyond the 4-hour block. The training coordinators also indicated that this training was to be above and beyond the in-service training already provided to agents. The regional offices appear to coordinate the mandatory training, while training in the units and districts appears to be less structured and more focused on local issues and needs.

Parole regions are dispersed geographically, presenting several challenges for the training coordinators. Training must be scheduled at multiple locations in order to equalize participant travel time. The number of 7(k) employees in the regions has increased dramatically over the last several years and the regional training staff in at least two regions has remained relatively stable.

Each parole agent provides his/her supervisor with a 168-hour schedule for the 28-day work period. It incorporates the four hours of 7(k) training time and the additional four hours that are required for parole agents to meet the 168-hour requirement. As noted earlier, institutional correctional peace officers in posted positions receive four hours for PPWA as part of their 168-hour work requirement.

The respondents stated that training is valuable only if it is relevant. Another respondent stated that any training improves employee performance. Instructional strategies vary, depending on whether the course is mandated and has a lesson plan, and whether the training is offered at the unit, district or region level. As noted earlier, the unit and district training focus on local needs. This could include bringing in a speaker from a community drug

placement program or a representative from the district attorney's office to discuss policy and process for arresting and charging parole violators. Respondents indicated that this training is beneficial because it relates directly to their duties as parole agents.

Training coordinators were asked whether make-up classes were common. They indicated that since the training is generally held during the regular workday, parole agents attend as scheduled by their supervisors. In addition, if they miss the training at one location, they can travel to the other locations.

The procedures for ensuring compliance with the 7(k) mandate are different in parole regions than in the institutions. Parole agents provide the supervisors with their 168-work hours for the 28-day work period. If those hours are maintained and the supervisors sign off on their time sheets, there is no issue of non-compliance.

Each region has procedures for selection of instructors. One region looks for instructors who are T-4-T'd, have taught before, and/or are nominated by their units and districts. The regional training coordinator will fill in when necessary. In addition, since some of the 7(k) training consists of community presentations and interagency meetings, the issue of instructor selection and qualifications is moot. Another region uses instructors who are trained, while yet another has four training coordinators within the region to offer training.

The training officers indicated some concerns with training and 7(k) in particular:

- *Some Course Mandates are Less Relevant for Parole Agents*: For example, regions were required to offer eight hours of training on *Armstrong*, which deals with individuals with physical disabilities. The impetus behind the case and the subsequent training requirement has more relevance to institutional staff than to field parole staff. As one training officer indicated, "parole agents already accommodate the special needs of parolees." In one respondent's opinion, you could cover the material in one hour and use the remaining hours for needed staff training. The general impression is that many of the mandates are driven by institutional problems, not field issues.

- *Need to Review Annual Mandates*: There was a general concern that some of the training is redundant and needs to be reviewed to determine its relevancy to the work of parole agents and updated on a regular basis.
- *Insufficient Number of Trained and Interested Instructors*: Most agreed that it is a challenge to maintain a core group of instructors within the region who can conduct the training. In addition, one coordinator noted that it is a 'second job' for some instructors, which affects the quality of the instruction.

The respondents indicated that employees would probably be happy if 7(k) 'went away', though in some cases they are getting used to the extra hours. They also suggested that the training mandate language in the agreement between the state and the correctional officers union was geared towards institutional employees and does not reflect the needs of parole agents in the field. For these and other reasons, the respondents made the following recommendations:

- Develop standardized lesson plans on subjects required for all parole agents.
- Examine training offered through the California Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission (POST) to determine relevancy and applicability to parole agents.
- Conduct a review of parole agent duties to determine training needs that can accommodate different work responsibilities of parole agents. For example, in one office, certain agents may do most of the arrests while another agent writes most of the reports.
- Provide more T-4-T instructional time so that the instructor pool expands. This would reduce the travel and per diem costs to send trainers to various locations within a region.
- Assign training officer positions to each region based on the number of agents and characteristics of caseloads (e.g., workload ratios).
- Provide regions with flexibility to determine employee classification for the training officer; which doesn't necessarily need to be a parole agent.
- Enhance training budgets to include monies for training materials and out-service training.

- Explore CPOST rules regarding how an instructor teaches (e.g., read lesson plan verbatim) and require CPOST to develop a more expeditious review process of lesson plan revisions.
- Examine the potential use and costs for on-line training in such areas as writing remediation, which provides for self-paced instruction.

These recommendations recognize the unique work environment of field parole agents, the geographic dispersion of parole offices, and the need for quality and relevant training.

Parole Agents' Perception of 7(k) Training From Survey Responses

Characteristics of Respondents

Parole agent I and parole agent II specialists were administered a survey to measure their impressions of 7(k) training (see Appendix 2). They were asked to rate the 7(k) training by quality of instruction, organization, usefulness of material, and applicability of the training material to job needs. Parole agents were also asked to evaluate the delivery method and indicate whether 7(k) training improved within the last six months.

Table 5 presents the number of parole agents responding to the survey (a summary of survey responses can be found in Chart 4 in Appendix 4). Five hundred ninety-one parole agents representing the four parole regions answered all or part of the survey. While a number of respondents did not indicate whether they were parole agents I or II, overall there were 411 parole agent I's and 70 parole agent II specialists who returned the survey instrument. The mean years of service were 10.6 years for parole agent I's and 16.8 years for parole agent II specialists. There were 137 responses from Region I, 55 from Region II, 187 from Region III, and 212 from Region IV.

Table 5. Number of CDC Parole Agents Responding by 7(k) Employee Class

Employee Class	*N*
PAI	*411*
PAII (Spec)	*70*
Unknown	*110*

Overall Assessment of 7(k) Training: Instructional Quality, Organization, and Usefulness of Courses

Parole agents were asked to rate the overall quality of 7(k) training in terms of instruction, organization, and usefulness of the course material, and then rate each training area separately. The training covers 11 areas:

- Supervision of parolees
- Communications (e.g., oral, report writing, records)
- Investigations (e.g., interviews, crime scene preservation)
- Arrests (e.g., in-office, high risk entry)
- Safety (e.g., awareness, ergonomics)
- Departmental (e.g., *Clark*, *Armstrong*, EEO)
- Case decision making
- Interagency activities/meetings (local law enforcement (LE) meetings)
- Community resource presentations
- Legal (sex offender registration, victim notification)
- Interstate procedures

If applicable, respondents could also indicate additional training areas if they were not listed on the survey instrument.

Overall, parole agents indicated moderate satisfaction with 7(k) training in terms of instructional quality, organization, and usefulness of course material (see S-Table 47). Though 50 percent (N=203) of the responding agents found the quality of instruction to be good/average, another 40 percent (N=165) found instruction to be poor or below average. In terms of organization, 33 percent (N=133) of the agents stated that it was good, while another 40 percent (N=165) indicated that organization was poor or fair. When rating usefulness of material, 35 percent (N=142) of the agents found the material useful, while 15 percent (N=62) indicated that it was not useful at all or a waste of time.

Twenty-seven percent (N=62) of the agents with more than 11 years of service rated the quality of instruction as poor, while only 10 percent (N=3) of the agents with less than two

years made a similar rating (see S-Table 49). Similar discrepancies between these agents were also noted when looking at organization and usefulness of material; where 21 percent of the more veteran agents (N=50) rated organization poor and 18 percent found the material was useless (N=41), only two agents with less than two years rated the organization as poor (7%) and three agents indicated that the material was not useful (10%). The data indicated that overall, as years of service increased, levels of satisfaction with instruction, organization and course material decreased slightly.

Specific Assessment of 7(k) Training Areas

Respondents were asked to share their perceptions of 7(k) training and to rate each training area. Most agents expressed a high level of satisfaction with almost all of the training in terms of the quality of instruction. In fact, anywhere from 65 to 78 percent (N=340 to over 400) of the parole agents found instructional quality to be good and very good/excellent (see S-Tables 50a & b). Their ratings of course organization and usefulness of course material were not as high. Approximately 40 percent of the agents rated organization of the investigations, communications, supervision of parolees, legal and community resource presentations to be poor or fair.

Another 40 percent of the parole agents indicated that the course material for all training areas was useful. However, approximately 10 percent (N=50) indicated the material was not useful at all, and another 20 percent (N=100) found the course material somewhat useful. Though the number of parole agent II specialists was relatively small in comparison with the number of responding parole agent I's, the data indicate that the parole agent II specialists had a slightly higher level of dissatisfaction with course organization and usefulness of course material across most training areas (see S-Tables 51a & b through 52a & b). Finally, there were no discernable differences based on years of service in officer perception of the instructional quality, course organization and usefulness of materials in most training areas (see S-Tables 53a & b through 56a & b).

When asked to list the three training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills, respondents identified four prime training areas: arrests (N=193, 42%); supervision of

parolees (N=171, 37%); departmental (N=146, 32%) and communications (N=137, 30%). Approximately 24 percent (N=112) identified case decision making was important (see S-Table 57). When looking at the two employee classifications, 38 percent (N=119) of parole agent I's identified supervision of parolees and 17 percent (N=8) of parole agent II specialists indicated that this training area most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 58). On the other hand, a slightly higher percentage of parole agent II specialists identified case decision making and interagency activities as valuable in terms of improving their knowledge and skills.

Level of Confidence About Performing Duties

Parole agents were asked how confident they felt about performing their duties and responsibilities after receiving 7(k) training (see S-Table 59). Of the 565 responses, approximately one-third (N=191) of the agents expressed satisfaction with 30 of the agents stating they were extremely confident and 161 stating they were very confident about performing their duties after 7(k) training. Two hundred ten agents reported they were neutral or had no opinion as to whether the training improved their level of confidence (37%). Another 106 parole agents reported that they were somewhat confident (19%) and 62, which represented 11 percent of the responding agents, reported that they were not confident at all about performing their duties after 7(k) training.

When asked if they learned how to apply the principles gained in 7(k) to work-related situations, 47 percent (N=266) reported they strongly agreed or agreed that they would be able to relate the training to their work situation (see S-Table 60). One hundred eighty-seven parole agents (about one-third) expressed no opinion and 112 reported either disagreement or strong disagreement with the idea that they would be able to apply the training.

Learning Style and Preferred Training Delivery Method

Responding parole agents indicated that they learned best with a hands-on teaching approach (44 percent or N=253), and that videos and discussions (15 percent or approximately N=91) also facilitated their learning (see S-Table 61). Only nine percent or 55 of the responding parole agents found value in the lecture method of teaching.

Parole agents were then asked, based on their 7(k) training experience, to rate specific delivery methods of training in terms of whether they were useful for learning the material or applying the skills (see S-Tables 62a & b). Again, the data indicate that more active learning strategies, including role play/hands on, scenarios and demonstrations, were the instructional delivery methods that were extremely useful for learning the material and applying the skills inherent in the training. On the other hand, anywhere from 45 to 50 percent of the respondents also found most of the delivery methods (e.g., lecture, video, handouts, staff meetings) useful in terms of learning the material and applying the skills.

The three delivery methods that responding parole agents indicated most improved their ability to learn the material and apply the skills were: 48 percent (N=229) identified scenarios; 39 percent (N=184) identified role play/hands-on; and 37 percent (N=176) identified demonstrations (see S-Table 63). Lecture was favored by 30 percent (N=144) and about 23 percent (N=112) respectively favored videos, group work, and staff meetings. While the number of parole agent II specialists were relatively small, there were no discernable differences in preferences for delivery methods when compared to parole agent I's (see S-Table 64).

Finally, when asked if 7(k) training had improved over the past six months, 66 percent of the responding agents (N=377) indicated that training had not improved recently while another 30 percent (N=167) saw improvement in the training (see S-Table 65).

Overall Impressions of 7(k) Training and Recommendations for Improvement

Parole agents were asked to write any comments about their overall impressions of 7(k) training. As with the institutional correctional peace officers, their responses were classified into categories that represent the general intent of the individual responses.

Overall Impressions. Forty-seven percent (N=233) of the responding agents expressed general dissatisfaction with the 7(k) training program (see Table 6). Their specific statements included: "waste of time", "don't like it", "it's boring", "trying to nullify liability", "same material over and over again", "not worth the 5 percent pay", and "get rid of it". Several agents stated that it did not help them in their day-to-day supervision of parolees because the course material was not relevant. Other agents commented that the training received at the unit level was most relevant because it related directly to their job.

Table 6. Coded Comments of Impressions Made by CDC Parole Agents

Coded Comments of Impressions	Number	Percent
General dissatisfaction	*233*	47.0
Generally OK training	*89*	17.9
Useful	*83*	16.7
Repetitive	*22*	4.4
Information not relevant	*21*	4.2
Instructor quality	*16*	3.2
Great	*11*	2.2
General comments	*9*	1.8
Training schedule	*8*	1.6
Class length	*6*	1.2

Note: More than one response possible

There was a general level of dissatisfaction expressed about the way the training was offered and the scope and breadth of the training topics. Parole agents stated that there were too many lectures and reading straight from the text or PowerPoint, and they wanted more hands-on and joint training with other law enforcement agencies. Several respondents made reference to the need for more weapons and tactical training, parole agent safety training, and information on changing departmental policies and procedures. Others stated that the training was very elementary and only suitable for the apprenticeship level agents. A related concern was that their time could be better spent providing services to parolees in the field.

Approximately one-third of the respondents (N=172) expressed satisfaction with the training, stating that it was good, had improved much, provided good updates, helped meet mandatory requirements, and was very helpful. In addition, one agent stated, "In law enforcement, it is important to always train and therefore, 7(k) is a good idea." Others expressed frustration with agents during training, who created bad class environments and made it difficult for those in the room who wanted to learn.

Consistent with other 7(k) employee groups, agents wanted the training during regular work hours, and split into two 2-hour blocks. They indicated that often trainers struggle to fill the four hours. Agents expressed a desire to bring in outside experts to train, rather than rely on agents to come up with a resource or community contact to use for 7(k) training.

Recommendations. Respondents made several suggestions for improving 7(k) training (see Table 7):

- more hands-on and scenario-type training;
- update training materials, including lesson plans, overheads, and handouts;
- use more videos;
- expand the subject matter covered in training (e.g., case management skills, high risk arrest, violation, time management, agent safety, undercover operations);
- offer training that is more relevant and job-related;
- use more experts as trainers, rather than handing an agent a lesson plan to teach;
- cross-training with other law enforcement agencies; and
- conduct needs assessments to determine what parole agents believe they need to enhance their work performance

There were other training areas identified as needed by the respondents including: case reviews, discharge reviews, community resources, drug treatment, self defense, firearm searches, court testimony, board of prison terms, interview and interrogation, and field entry. A number of comments were made about the need to contract with outside companies and

Table 7. Coded Comments of Recommendations Made by CDC Parole Agents

Coded Comments of Recommendations	Number	Percent
Drop It	122	29.4
Update Materials/More videos, subjects	84	20.2
Hands On/Scenario/Participation	57	13.7
Better Instructors	38	9.2
Make Relevant, job related	35	8.4
Miscellaneous comments	26	6.3
Flexibility/Schedule	22	5.3
Standardize	9	2.2
Block Training	8	1.9
During Regular Hours	7	1.7
Less Training Time	5	1.2
Interesting/Fun	4	1.0
Money issues	3	0.7
Fine Now, Useful	1	0.2
Include Supervisors	1	0.2

Note: More than one response possible

agencies to provide quality training and to bring in individuals from 'collateral agencies' to provide training. Several respondents expressed the need for joint training with local law enforcement agencies, especially in areas of high-risk entry and arrests. Other comments focused on standardizing the training throughout the region and the state, and holding the department responsible for ensuring that every agent get the same training. As one respondent noted, "[t]raining should be formalized region wide and should be developed with a plan to genuinely develop staff in all areas of parole work using qualified/skilled trainers."

There were, however, approximately 30 percent of the respondents (N=122) who wanted to drop 7(k) training, either because of poor instructors and instruction, lack of relevance to the job, redundancy, and/or scheduling. The comments around the issue of scheduling related to location (e.g., long drive for some agents, conduct in local office) and training block, where some agents wanted to have it offered on one day for 8 hours or in a 4-hour block and notice is given in advance of training.

California Youth Authority

7(k) Training Course Offerings In Institutions and Camps

Each institution and camp was asked to provide information on courses offered under 7(k) for the review period beginning October 4, 1998 and ending with the 7(k) work period of July 8, 2000. The specific information requested included class names, number of sessions, length of class, number of staff trained and any available lesson plans that include course title, class length, target population, performance objectives, and evaluation procedures.

The information was received in various formats and did not lend itself to a quantitative analysis. Many institutions indicated that data collection on 7(k) training did not begin until early 1999. The data provided by the camps was incomplete and will be described only briefly in this report. Finally, there was an inadequate number of lesson plans submitted, so no analysis is possible. Thus, caution must be exercised when generalizing any of these findings to any particular institution or all the institutions statewide.

The training courses offered in the institutions was divided into 18 areas: casework; communications; CPR; departmental; first aid; health and safety; infectious disease; institutional security; physical/mechanical/chemical restraint; room/cell extraction; 37/38 mm gas gun; sexual harassment/EEO; staff-offender interaction (SOI); suicide prevention assessment response (SPAR); ward rights; water safety; workplace violence; and other (e.g., computers, gangs).

In terms of total training hours, staff received: 32,367 hours of SOI; 16,483 hours of restraint training; 15,652 hours of institutional security; 15,496 hours of CPR; and 12,931 on ward rights (see Table 8). The data indicate that there were a significant number of staff trained in SOI (N=9,802), institutional security (N=4,720), casework (N=3,136) and health and safety (N=2,809). Like CDC, the data suggest that staff receive training under 7(k) in the areas formerly mandated as part of block and/or annual training mandates.

Table 8. California Youth Authority Training Courses by Number of Staff Trained and Total Training Hours October 4, 1998 – July 8, 2000

Training Courses	Number Staff Trained	Total Training Hours
37/38 mm Gas Gun	234	592
Casework	3,136	6,912
Communications	962	2,217
CPR	2,135	15,496
Departmental	695	1,678
First aid	1,254	3,167
Health and Safety	2,809	5,802
Infectious Disease	2,090	4,717
Institutional Security	4,720	15,652
Physical/Mechanical/Chemical Restraint	5,063	16,483
Room/Cell Extraction	597	1,809
Sexual Harassment/EEO	1,932	4,219
SOI	9,802	32,367
SPAR	1,955	3,329
Ward Rights	4,556	12,931
Water Safety	757	1,158
Workplace Violence	993	2,328
Other	1,863	7,998

There was similar training offered to correctional peace officers in the camps, including SOI, SPAR, physical/chemical/ mechanical restraint, CPR, DDMS and defensive driving. The available data also indicate that officers/counselors were offered training in report writing, substance abuse, counseling, and bloodborne pathogens.

Institutional Training Officers' Perceptions of 7(k) Training From Interviews

The training officers in the 11 youth correctional facilities were asked about the implementation of the 7(k) program, course selection and scheduling, program impact on employee performance, usefulness of the training tracking system, and their overall impressions of and recommendations for the 7(k) training program (see Appendix 2 for interview organization). These staff have other assignments in addition to their training responsibilities. In fact, in most cases, their training assignment was their secondary if not 'tertiary' assignment, which is demonstrated by the fact that one training officer is the program administrator for the institution (i.e., third in command). As our research progressed, several institutions created full-time training officer positions but more than half of the training officers still have other assignments.

Several of the training officers interviewed were not in their current position when the 7(k) program was implemented. Most, however, agreed that there was little guidance provided by

the department regarding implementation of the program. In addition, many of the 7(k) employees didn't really understand much about this new mandate. Initially, there was time spent on meet-and-confers at the institutions in order to address scheduling issues, given the parameters set out in the MOU (e.g., 28-day work period, 4-hour block). Most institutions initially used whatever lesson plans were available, including adapting material from the basic academy courses.

More recently, the department has issued directives mandating that the institution offer specific training, such as casework/small group and the restricted program, within a specific time period. This requires rescheduling training courses and may result in officers' non-compliance with training mandates.

Most institutions set aside up to eight days during the 28-day work period, with up to three 4-hour training blocks on each day. While most institutions had at least one classroom, several have no designated classroom and used the library, visiting area, or school classroom for the training. When the MOU was changed in 2000 to allow officers to select their training day, attendance at the classes during the early part of the 28-day work period was relatively low, while attendance during the latter part of the period was high and in some cases exceeded the capacity of the training room. This posed challenges for the training officers in terms of physical plant layout and size-restricted classes.

There is one notable exception to the situation described above. In one particular institution, the training officer sets up a master schedule where each officer has an assigned training day. The 7(k) employee contacts the training officer if s/he wants to attend another day. According to the training officer, the majority of the officers attend training on their assigned day. The researchers concluded that the institutional culture at that facility supported the use of the assigned day concept, in spite of the MOU that allowed officers to attend on any day. In another institution, officers sign-up for training nine days in advance. The training office generates a pre-printed sign-in sheet the day before the training. That pre-printed list is accurate about 95 percent of the time. Officers who miss their scheduled training contact the office to reschedule.

The agreement required training to be offered in 4-hour blocks, with a minimum of one hour per subject. Several respondents indicated that there was not a total of four hours of training, due to the time it took officers to come from their posts. One person indicated that officers coming off the first watch at 6:00 a.m. were more prone to be late than officers attending training after second or third watch. Most instructors provide a 10-minute break each hour and a number of respondents stated that if the instructor finished covering the material early, s/he would fill the time in with videos or subject-related discussions.

The majority of the training offered was in response to a mandate, whether statutory, departmental, court-ordered, or local rule. Each year, the training office staff is required to conduct a training needs assessment (TNA) to elicit staff recommendations for future training. Many respondents indicated that because of the number of training mandates, most are unable to offer these needed training within the 52-hour time frame.

Several respondents mentioned 'tailgate' training. It can be described as more on-shift training offered by the supervisor. In most instances, the training was informal but the training staff agreed that it was beneficial because it addressed issues specific to one's current assignment. Several respondents indicated that 'tailgate' referred to health and safety training that is mandated by Cal-OSHA. Supervisors on the units would find a 30-minute period (e.g., when wards are down) to discuss safety issues or use a 'read and initial board,' which would have the written material available to the officer to read and initial when complete.

One institution is requiring a supervisor or manager to attend each class and is implementing a new policy that requires an evaluation on each class and each instructor. The training officer indicated that it was a way to provide quality control over the content and delivery of training within the institution.

When asked whether 7(k) training has improved employee performance, there were mixed responses. The training officers acknowledge that 7(k) created a vehicle for on-going training. They also stated that it improved the learning curve, provided a better vehicle to

ensure compliance with training mandates and therefore employee performance, or was a review for veterans in many cases. Improvement of employee performance was also influenced by the quality of instructors, which in some instances was bad due to the inability to select 'qualified and effective' instructors. Overall, their responses suggested there was some improvement in employee performance, in spite of officer complaints about the scheduling of the training. Employees do not like the four hours after their regular shift.

The compliance procedures varied among the institutions. Most had a formal process, beginning with a required verbal discussion with the supervisor, to a written 'work improvement discussion' (WID), set training day and ultimately an adverse action. In several instances, the training officer indicated that the supervisors do WIDs after they are notified about any 'no shows.' A more informal process would include e-mail to an employee's supervisor requesting s/he discuss the matter with the employee. Unless excused (e.g., extended medical leave), the officer has his/her pay docked.

Instructional strategies included lecture, PowerPoint, group discussion, handouts, use of videos, and to a limited degree, hands-on activities. There were some instances when a video was used when no instructor was available. Many respondents interpret CPOST requirements that the content of the lesson plan must be read verbatim, thus limiting instructor discretion and reducing creativity in the use of alternative instructional strategies. Finally, respondents indicated that some testing occurred, but mostly in the competency or proficiency-based training (e.g., physical restraints). Several institutions try to evaluate all of their classes.

The training officers perceived that 7(k) employees held varying opinions regarding the quality of the instruction. When presented information in an interesting manner (e.g., instructor not reading verbatim from lesson plan) and when the officers perceived it could help them perform their jobs, they tended to be a bit more attentive. Employees do not generally like the four hours of training after their shift, but want the additional pay. Veteran staff tend to view the training more negatively because the lesson plans have not been revised in years. These staff also had concerns when newer employees were the instructors, the

frame of mind being, "What can that person teach me?" On the other hand, one training officer indicated that training was not offered on a regular basis prior to the implementation of the 7(k) program. It was that officer's opinion that employees saw the benefit to regular training.

When asked about the inclusion of non-custody staff in 7(k) training, most indicated that it was a great vehicle to ensure all staff are in compliance with some training mandates (e.g., EEO). In addition, several training officers indicated that it helped both employee classes understand their respective responsibilities, and provided non-custody staff with a better understanding for security and treatment issues.

In spite of the challenges posed by the lack of a designated training officer and related concerns, the interviews with the CYA institutional training officers revealed their commitment to quality training. They also expressed some frustration with elements of the training process and procedures (see Chart 5 in Appendix 4 for a summary of the issues):

- *Insufficient number of qualified instructors*: Almost without exception, respondents expressed their concern with the lack of available and willing T-4-T'd instructors. Training officers looked for instructors who were relatively proficient in the subject matter and had the respect of his/her peers. In a few cases, this placed a burden on the single training officer to provide a lot of the training, or resulted in poor instruction.
- *Few available lesson plans*: The department provided only a few lesson plans (i.e., SOI and SPAR). A lot of individual effort was spent on developing "materials" for training, which in many cases were not formal lesson plans. One comment was that SOI focused on staff-ward relations yet should focus on ward-ward crisis intervention.
- *Limited institutional flexibility*: 7(k) is the vehicle to provide training to its designated correctional peace officers. Most of the courses offered under the 7(k) umbrella are in fact mandated, whether by departmental directive, statute, litigation or local rule.
- *Potential non-compliance for some employees*: Several respondents indicated that all the mandated training totaled more than 52 hours per year. The result is that some

employees may be out of compliance in some area (e.g., physical restraints, tactical team training), in part due to scheduling and employee training completion date.

- *Other training suffered as a result of 7(k)*: Due to limited training staff and budgets, the training office was unable to schedule and offer additional in-service training for officers or supervisors.
- *Inadequate computerized training tracking system*: Several of the training officers do not currently use the computer program (i.e., Mac TIS) to track their training. Others indicated that they find the program has numerous 'bugs' and is of limited use.

The researchers concluded that the lack of a designated training officer and few available lesson plans were two of the more critical issues that affected the quality of training offered under the 7(k) training umbrella. It may have also contributed to the respondents' perception that employees were generally disillusioned with this training.

Best Practices

The interviews with the training officers revealed that there were some innovative strategies and practices in place to enhance 7(k) training. In one instance, a supervisor or manager attends all classes, and each class and instructor is evaluated. Other institutions use on-site briefings while a unit/yard is closed to transmit information to employees. In one institution, the local agreement between the institutional management and the employees union allowed employees to attend training on their designated training day. Such an arrangement enhanced planning and reduced costs (e.g., instructor) associated with small classes. In some cases, team teaching was used and another institution provided the course content by using a game format (i.e., Who Wants To Be A Millionaire).

Recommendations

The CYA training officers offered the following recommendations for improving the 7(k) training program, all of which require departmental action:

1. Create a full-time training officer position (along with a duty statement) in each institution, which includes an office assistant/technician. This would eliminate the current frustration felt by the training officers, who must juggle their responsibilities

to their primary assignment with their secondary responsibilities as training officer. It would also allow for the training office to respond to the training needs of all staff, including the supervisors.

2. Provide a T-4-T instructor program in general lesson plan development and design, and teaching strategies. In addition, offer T-4-T in specialized areas on a more frequent basis. This latter recommendation relates to the fact that several lesson plans require constant revisions (e.g., DDMS, restraints, ward grievances).
3. Establish a statewide training calendar, which would ensure that all employees were current with training mandates and would facilitate the transfer of employees between institutions.
4. Standardize lesson plans, especially for mandated courses. Include within those lesson plans an area where each institution can incorporate site-specific information, which addresses physical plant layout, institutional mission, specialized programs and ward populations, and custody level of the institution.

Several respondents stated that the CYA Institutions and Camps branch manual needs to be up-dated to clarify training mandates (e.g., bloodborne pathogens). Part of that up-date should include a departmental mission statement for training statewide. Many respondents suggested the need for additional resources for purchasing paper, modules, videos and other training necessities. They also expressed need for a designated classroom for training.

The department needs to clarify with CPOST the perceived requirement that when an approved lesson plan is available, the instructor must read the material verbatim or at a minimum, discuss every item in the lesson plan. The issue is whether the intent by CPOST is that the instructor address the critical information identified in the lesson plan, or if how s/he does it is left to the discretion of the instructor. Also, several respondents want CPOST to allow institutions to use games and other methods for training.

While the training officers recognize the benefits to the individual officers to select their training day, it placed scheduling and financial burdens on the office. Training staff

expressed frustration with their inability to plan, in terms of instructor needs and classroom space.

Institutional and Camp Employees' Perception of 7(k) Training From Survey Reponses

Characteristics of Respondents

Youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors, casework specialists, institutional parole agent I's, and medical technical assistants were asked their perceptions of and recommendations for the 7(k) training program (see Appendix 2). A total of 1,461 employees at 11 institutions and 32 employees at the camps responded to the survey. Table 9 presents the number of respondents by employee classification. On average, institutional parole agent I's had the longest service term with 14 years, while youth correctional counselors and casework specialists had the fewest years of service with nine years. Both youth correctional officers and MTAs had an average of 11 years of service. A summary of survey responses can be found in Appendix 4, Chart 6.

Table 9. Number of CYA Employees Responding by 7(k) Employee Class

Employee Class	*N*
Institution	
Youth Correctional Officer	*583*
Youth Correctional Counselor	*515*
Casework Specialist	*18*
Institutional Parole Agent I	*47*
Medical Technical Assistant	*17*
Unknown Classification	*280*
Camp	
Youth Correctional Officer	*9*
Youth Correctional Counselor	*17*
Parole Agent I	*1*
Unknown Classification	*5*

Most institutional employees with one year of service or less worked a varied, or other type of watch, while most of those with more than one year of service worked the second watch (see S-Table 66). Thirty-two percent (N=41) of those institutional employees with less than one year of service did not indicate which watch they worked, while 16 percent of those with more than one year of service failed to specify their watch (N=200). In terms of camps, nearly all but one of the employees have more than one year of service, and of these employees, most worked the second watch.

Overall Assessment of 7(k) Training: Instructional Quality, Organization, and Usefulness of Courses

CYA employees were asked to rate the overall quality of 7(k) training in terms of instruction, organization, and usefulness of the course content, and then rate each training area separately. The training covers 17 areas:

- Communications (e.g., oral, written reports, computers)
- Casework (e.g., groups, individual counseling, board reports, resource groups)
- SPAR
- Water safety
- Workplace violence
- Sexual harassment/EEO
- Health & safety (e.g., IIPP, EAP, asbestos)
- Infectious disease
- SOI
- First aid
- CPR
- Chemical restraints
- Physical & mechanical restraints
- Room/cell extraction
- 37/38mm gas gun
- Ward rights (e.g., DDMS, ward grievance)
- Institutional security (e.g., key control, personal alarm devices, counts, emergency plan, gang awareness, evidence preservation)

If applicable, respondents could also indicate additional training areas if they were not listed on the survey instrument.

On the whole, institutional and camp employees indicated moderate satisfaction with 7(k) training in terms of instructional quality, organization, and usefulness of courses (see S-Table 67). Instructional quality received the highest ratings among all employees, while slightly

less than 60 percent expressed only moderate satisfaction with course organization (N=665) and content (N=17).

More specifically, 80 percent of institutional employees (N=1,005) indicated that instructional quality was good or very good, while over half felt that courses were fairly well organized (N=665) and that course content was useful (N=594). However, approximately 30 percent of institutional employees (N=364) found course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time. Camp employees expressed similar sentiments. Twenty-six of the 29 respondents rated instructional quality good or very good, while 18 found courses to be fairly well organized and 20 found course content to be useful or extremely useful.

Institutions. Most respondents indicated a modest level of satisfaction with the quality of course instruction, organization, and content (see S-Table 68). In terms of the assessment measures, employees in all classifications expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with respect to instructional quality. Approximately 80 percent of youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors, casework specialists, and institutional parole agent I's found instructional quality to be good or very good. In contrast, only nine of the 14 responding MTAs (64%) found course instruction to be at that level of quality.

Institutional employees attributed the greatest level of dissatisfaction to the usefulness of course content. Approximately 63 percent of respondents (N=591) found course organization to be good or excellent. Youth correctional counselors expressed the greatest level of dissatisfaction with course organization, with 28 percent (N=125) finding it to be fair or poor. In terms of course content, approximately 60 percent of institutional employees considered courses to be useful or very useful (N=606).

More specifically, 33 percent (N=156) of youth correctional counselors and approximately 26 percent (N=128) of youth correctional officers indicated that course content was only somewhat useful or a waste of time. It is important to point out that although three of the 14 responding MTAs expressed similar opinions regarding course content, the same number failed to respond to this question, so it may be difficult to draw any specific conclusions

about their views on this assessment measure. Eighty percent or more of institutional employees responded to the questions on all measures, so this issue does not appear to be of concern among those employee classes.

Years of Service. In terms of general observations, youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors with 11 or more years of service expressed a greater level of dissatisfaction than those with fewer years of service across all assessment measures (see S-Table 69). Youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors with less than two years of service seemed to be the most satisfied with instruction, organization, and course content. The level of satisfaction decreased with increased length of service.

However, regardless of service term, a vast majority of youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors indicated a relatively high level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction. Turning specifically to youth correctional officers first, between 80 and 90 percent (N=249) of these employees with 10 years of service or less considered instructional quality to be good or very good. Seventy-three percent of youth correctional officers with 11 or more years of service rated instructional quality in this manner (N=139).

Youth correctional officer perception of course organization and usefulness of course content fared slightly worse. Although 77 percent (N=69) employees with less than two years of service rated course organization very high, only 53 percent (N=101) of the employees with more than 11 years of service considered organization to be good or very good. About one-third (N=60) found course organization to be fair or poor. Two-thirds of the youth correctional officers with between two and 10 years of service found organization to be good or very good (N=202).

In terms of the usefulness of course content, 80 percent (N=72) of those with less than two years of service found the content to be useful or very useful. But only 54 percent (N=102) of those employees with more than 11 years of service rated content in this manner, leaving a third of who considered it to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time (N=62). Once again, two-thirds (N=205) of youth correctional officers with between two and 10 years of

service indicated that course content was useful or very useful, with approximately 25 percent (N=61) finding it only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

Youth correctional counselors, regardless of years of service, expressed similar sentiments. Thirty-six of the 42 respondents with fewer than two years of service rated instructional quality very high. About 80 percent (N=308) of those employees with more than two years of service rated instructional quality in this manner.

Like youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors also expressed only a moderate to low level of satisfaction with course organization and content. Although 69 percent (N=29) of those employees with fewer than two years of service and those who have served between six and 10 years (N=60) found organization to be good or excellent, about 30 percent (N=31) of employees with between two and five years and those with more than 11 years of service (N=62) indicated that courses were relatively poorly organized.

Usefulness of the course material appeared to fare even worse among these employees. Thirty-five percent (N=152) of youth correctional counselors, regardless of the length of their service, pointed to the relative lack of usefulness in the content of courses offered, rating them only somewhat useful or a waste of time. Approximately 54 percent of those employees (N=214) who have served more than two years found course content to be at a high level of usefulness. Conversely, 27 employees with fewer than two years of service did find the course content to be useful or very useful.

Watches. The data revealed that youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors on all three watches were generally satisfied with the quality of instruction, organization, and course content (see S-Table 70). Employees who worked the second and third watches expressed the greatest levels of satisfaction across all three measures, while over three-fourths of respondents indicated a moderately high level of satisfaction with instructional quality.

Examining youth correctional officers first, the data show that those employees who worked a varied watch expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction and course organization, with 87 percent (N=90) of respondents considering instruction to be good or very good and 69 percent (N=71) finding organization to be at this level of quality as well.

Interestingly, those employees who worked the third watch expressed the lowest level of satisfaction with instructional quality and course organization. Fifteen out of 67 respondents who worked this watch rated instructional quality as fair or poor, while 19 of these employees rated organization at that level. Higher levels of satisfaction with instructional quality were found among 90 of those who worked the first watch (78%) and 100 who worked the second watch (80%), while only 61 percent (N=71, 1st watch; N=75, 2nd watch) found organization to be good or excellent.

Course content received the lowest ratings from all youth correctional officers, regardless of their watch. For example, 29 of those who worked the first watch found course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time, while 40 of those employees who worked the second watch gave course content the same low rating. Nineteen respondents who worked the third watch and 22 respondents who worked a varied watch also indicated that they did not find course content to be very useful at all.

Among youth correctional counselors, instructional quality received the greatest praise (see S-Table 70). For example, over 80 percent (N=304) of employees who worked the second, third, and varied watches found instructional quality to be good or very good. However, course organization and content received the lowest ratings among employees of these three watches. Those who worked the varied watch expressed the greatest level of dissatisfaction, especially with course organization and content. This finding runs contrary to the youth correctional officers who worked a varied watch. In terms of youth correctional counselors, 23 of 65 varied watch respondents rated course organization as fair or poor. Likewise, 27 of these respondents also considered course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

Youth correctional counselors who worked the second and third watches also expressed similar sentiments towards course organization and usefulness of course content. For example, approximately one-fourth of those employees who worked the second watch (N=40) indicated that course organization was fair or poor, while 30 percent (N=48) felt that course content was only somewhat useful or not useful at all. Likewise, 26 percent of employees of who worked the third watch (N=42) were also generally dissatisfied with course organization, considering it to be fairly poor. Additionally, 34 percent (N=54) found the course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

Camps. A majority of the 32 respondents indicated a moderate level of satisfaction with instructional quality, course organization, and the usefulness of course content. Both youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors seemed most satisfied with the quality of the instruction, while course organization and content received lower ratings.

The eight responding youth correctional counselors indicated that the instructional quality was good. However, only four of these respondents felt that courses were fairly well organized and useful, and one employee indicated that organization was fair and the courses were only somewhat useful. Fourteen youth correctional counselors found instructional quality good. Two respondents considered instructional quality to be only fair. In terms of course organization, 10 of these respondents found it to be good, but 31 percent considered it to be only fair. Similarly, 12 of these respondents found course content to be useful, but three employees only considered courses to be somewhat useful.

Specific Assessment of 7(k) Training Areas

Institutions. In the specific training areas, respondents were asked to share their perceptions of 7(k) training and to rate each training area. Most institutional employees expressed moderate satisfaction with instruction, organization, and usefulness of courses (see S-Tables 71a & b). Overwhelmingly, institutional employees more favorably viewed SOI, first aid, and CPR across all measures, with instructional quality receiving the highest ratings among all courses.

More specifically, approximately 93 percent of institutional employees considered the quality of instruction to be good or very good in the SOI (N=977), first aid (N=1,220), and CPR (N=1,288) courses. Employees indicated lower levels of satisfaction with the organization and the usefulness of these courses. Other courses that received relatively satisfactory ratings included health and safety and chemical restraints. The health and safety course fared quite well in terms of instructional quality, with 88 percent (N=1,075) indicating that it was good or very good. Seventy-three percent (N=775) of respondents felt that the content of this course was quite valuable. Likewise, 74 percent (N=1,037) of these employees found the chemical restraints course to be useful or very useful as well.

Most employees were least satisfied with casework, water safety, and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens training. Other courses receiving fairly low ratings included 37/38 mm gas gun and sexual harassment. In terms of instruction, approximately 21 percent considered casework (N=215), water safety (N=196), and 37/38 mm gas gun (N=151) to be below average or poor. Nearly one-third of these employees indicated that the organization of the casework (N=307), water safety (N=313), and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens (N=256) courses were fair or poor. An even greater percentage (36%) found the content of casework (N=333), water safety (N=354), and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens (N=226) to be only somewhat useful or not useful at all.

A specific inquiry of two employee classifications, youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors, did not reveal many differences from the general analysis of institutional employees (see S-Tables 71a & b and 72a & b). For example, in terms of youth correctional officers, first aid, CPR, and chemical restraints overwhelmingly received the highest ratings in terms of instructional quality, course organization, and content. More specifically, 93 percent of youth correctional officers considered the instructional quality of these courses to be good or very good. Seventy-eight percent of these employees found the organization of these courses to be good or excellent, while 81 percent considered the courses to be very useful.

Conversely, youth correctional officers expressed overwhelming dissatisfaction with casework (N=96, 40%), water safety (N=145, 38%), and SOI (N=172, 25%). The usefulness of the content of these courses fared the worst, indicating that these courses were only somewhat useful or a waste of time. Likewise, in terms of course organization, nearly one-third of the respondents found casework, water safety, and SOI to be fair or poor.

The data revealed similar results for youth correctional counselors (see S-Tables 72a & b). A majority of respondents expressed a high a level of satisfaction with the instructional quality, organization, and content of the first aid, CPR, and chemical restraints courses. In terms of instructional quality, respondents indicated that first aid (N=439, 92%), CPR (N=470, 96%) and chemical restraints (N=444, 91%) training was good or very good. Similarly, over three-quarters of youth correctional counselors found the organization of these courses to be good or excellent and the content of the courses to be very useful.

Similar to the youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors expressed lower levels of satisfaction with casework, water safety, and SOI in terms of instruction, organization, and content, while heath and safety and 37/38 mm gas gun training received low scores on the usefulness of their content. Youth correctional counselors seemed to be most dissatisfied with the usefulness of these courses. Respondents indicated that the content of casework (N=264, 57%), health and safety (N=265, 57%), SOI (N=243, 51%), and 37/38 mm gas gun (N=205; 58%) courses was only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

Youth correctional counselors found course organization to be only fair or poor for casework (N=164, 35%), water safety (N=129, 36%), and SOI (N=147, 31%). Course instruction fared somewhat better, though nearly one-fourth of these employees found the quality of instruction of these courses to be below average or poor. Lastly, approximately 21 percent (N=107) of youth correctional counselors indicated that the water safety course was not applicable to them. This finding may suggest that this particular course is not a necessary part of the training for these employees.

Overall, ratings of specific training areas did not vary much at all with respect to years of service. Most youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors, regardless of years of service, expressed moderate satisfaction with the instruction, organization, and content of the courses (see S-Tables 73a & b through 80a & b). Generally speaking, between 80 and 90 percent of youth correctional officers rated CPR, first aid, and chemical restraints training good or very good and found the content of these courses to be extremely useful (see S-Tables 73a & b through 76a & b). Approximately 84 percent of youth correctional counselors were generally satisfied with their training in these areas in terms of instruction, organization, and course content (see S-Tables 77a & b through 80a & b).

Youth correctional officers and counselors were equally dissatisfied with casework, water safety, and SOI training. Approximately 30 percent of youth correctional officers and 34 percent of youth correctional counselors highlighted the below average quality of instruction and organization of these courses, and they also noted that course content was not very useful.

More specific differences emerge when each employee class is examined separately in terms of their length of service. Youth correctional officers, regardless of length of service were overwhelmingly satisfied with the quality of instruction, while course organization and content received lower ratings. In general, the greatest level of satisfaction could be found with those with less than two years of service, while those with more than 11 years of service seemed the most dissatisfied with the training.

Over 90 percent of the youth correctional officers with less than two years of service considered the instructional quality of 10 training areas to be very good or excellent (see S-Tables 73a & b). Although CPR and chemical restraints training received high ratings across all measures, these employees also considered the sexual harassment training to be one of the better courses. Ninety-eight percent (N=97) considered instruction to be very good or excellent and 84 percent (N=83) found the course organization to be very good or excellent as well.

Approximately 95 percent of youth correctional officers with more than two years of service (N=400) rated the CPR course good or excellent in terms of instructional quality. This course also received positive feedback in terms of organization and course content, with 70 to almost 90 percent considering its organization to be very good or excellent (N=341) and the content to be very useful (N=341). Other training areas that were rated fairly high by those with more than two years of service included first aid, chemical restraints, and physical restraints, with at least three-quarters or more of these employees finding these courses to be moderately satisfactory across all measures.

Dissatisfaction with courses increased as the length of service increased. For example, although an about 30 percent of youth correctional officers indicated a high level of disappointment with the casework, water safety, and SOI courses, it became more pronounced for employees with more than 11 years of service. Nearly half of the employees with 11 or more years of service (N=43) found casework training to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time. Thirty-five considered the organization of this course to be only fair or poor while 20 found the instructional quality to be below average or poor (see S-Tables 76a & b). SOI, water safety, and ward rights also fared poorly. Approximately one-fourth of these employees found the instructional quality of water safety (N=35) and SOI (N=50) to be below average or poor. Seventy-two respondents rated the organization of SOI fair or poor while 85 employees indicated that course content was not very useful at all. Fifty-one employees also found ward rights training to be below average in terms of instructional quality, while 74 also considered its organization to be below average.

Youth correctional officers with between two and 10 years of service indicated moderate satisfaction with the training, with most satisfaction found with the CPR, first aid, chemical restraints, physical restraints, and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens courses (see S-Tables 74a & b and 75a & b). Once again, instructional quality received the highest ratings with over 90 percent of these employees finding it to be rather exceptional among the CPR, first aid, chemical restraints, and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens courses. Almost 84 percent of these employees found these courses to be fairly well organized. The content

of the CPR, first aid, chemical restraints, and physical restraints courses was found to be extremely useful by approximately 85 percent of the employees.

Youth correctional officers with between two and 10 years of service also indicated relative dissatisfaction with the casework, water safety, and SOI courses (see S-Tables 74a & b and 75a & b). Thirty-four employees noted the limited usefulness of casework training, while 58 employees found water safety to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time. In terms of SOI, 46 employees noted its below average quality of instruction, while 65 employees pointed out that the course was not very well organized. Additionally, 67 of these employees did not find the content of the course to be very useful.

Interestingly, youth correctional officers with between two and five years of service were the only employees to point out a higher level of dissatisfaction with the communications course (see S-Tables 74a & b). Seventeen employees found the quality of instruction to be below average or poor, while 29 indicated that the organization of the course was fair or poor.

As noted earlier, youth correctional counselors indicated a similar level of moderate satisfaction with the training, regardless of years of service (see S-Tables 77a & b through 80a & b). There is no real significant distinction among these employees with the various lengths of service. In other words, the levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction remained fairly uniform across all measures and among several courses, including CPR, first aid, chemical restraints, and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens.

The youth correctional counselors with less than two years of service seemed to be the most satisfied with their training (see S-Table 77a & b). For example, about 94 percent of these employees found the instructional quality of the first aid, CPR, and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens courses to be good or very good. First aid and CPR also fared very well on course organization and content measures; 75 employees felt these courses were well organized, while 64 indicated that the courses were very useful. These employees were the only ones to indicate a relatively high level of satisfaction with the sexual harassment

course. More specifically, 36 employees found the organization of the course to be good or very good, while 32 employees noted the usefulness of this training.

Other satisfactory views could be found among youth correctional counselors with more than two years of service (see S-Tables 78a & b through 80a & b). Approximately 90 percent (N=405) of these employees found the instructional quality of the first aid course to be good or very good. More than three-quarters of these employees with over two years of service also noted the good organization and usefulness of this particular course. Additionally, the CPR course also fared quite well on all measures. Over 95 percent (N=434) highlighted the good quality of instruction in this course, while 85 percent (N=373) noted its well-organized nature. Lastly, more than three-quarters felt that the content of the CPR course was very useful to their training program.

Other highly rated courses included chemical restraints, health and safety, and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens. Ninety-eight employees, with between two and five years of service, found the instructional quality of the health and safety course to be good or very good, while almost 92 percent (N=311) of youth correctional counselors with six years of service or more noted the high quality of instruction in the chemical restraints course. The infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens course fared well in terms of course content, with three-quarters of those with between two and five years of service (N=85) finding it to be very useful.

In contrast, youth correctional counselors expressed the greatest level of dissatisfaction with the casework, water safety, 37/38 mm gas gun, and SOI courses (see S-Tables 77a & b through 80a & b). As discussed earlier, approximately one-third of these employees highlighted the below average quality of instruction and organization of these courses and pointed out that these courses were not very useful to them in terms of their training program. Eight youth correctional counselors with less than two years of service indicated that the instructional quality of workplace violence was below average or poor (see S-Tables 77a & b). Five of these employees found the instruction of the room/cell extractions course to be

below average, while eight of them considered the organization of that course to be only fair or poor.

The communications course also received low ratings among some youth correctional officers on several measurement areas. Interestingly, 40 percent of the counselors with fewer than five years of service (N=59) did not find this course to be very useful at all (see S-Tables 77a & b through 78a & b). However, one-third of those with between two and 10 years of service (N=68) found the organization of the communications course to be only fair or poor (see S-Tables 78a & b through 79a & b). Employees with 11 years of service or more expressed views that were similar to employees with fewer years of service. However, a little more than one-third of them (N=82) did not find the workplace violence course to be very useful (see S-Table 80a & b).

The percentage of employees who did not find casework to be applicable seems to hold constant across all years of service. Almost 50 percent of the youth correctional counselors who have more than two years of service indicated that casework was not applicable to their training program (see S-Tables 86a & b through 88a & b). Similarly, a number of employees with varied years of service also pointed out that the water safety course is not applicable to them.

One-third of the youth correctional counselors with less than two years of service indicated that the water safety course was not applicable to them. This percentage decreases with increased years of service. It also remains the one course most noted as non-applicable by respondents.

Another interesting finding concerns the high percentage of those with less than two years of service who indicated that the room/cell extractions (37%) and the 37/38mm courses (41%) were not applicable to them (see S-Tables 77a & b). The room/cell extractions course also received low ratings from these employees in terms of instructional quality and course organization. Likewise, 29 counselors with between two and five years of service also

indicated that the 37/38 mm gas gun course was not applicable to them either (see S-Tables 78a & b).

Overall, institutional employees of all watches expressed a high level of satisfaction with the first aid, CPR, and chemical restraints courses (see S-Tables 81a & b through 88a & b). Approximately 84 percent of respondents considered their training in these areas to be very good and useful. In terms of youth correctional officers, their level of satisfaction with the other training areas did not vary that much among the various watches. Approximately three-quarters of those who worked the first, second, and varied watches indicated a high level of satisfaction with the organization and usefulness of the physical restraints training (see S-Tables 81a & b, 82a & b, and 83a & b). Ninety percent of those employees who worked the second watch (N=111) found the instructional quality of the room/cell extractions course to be good or very good (see S-Table 82a & b).

Sixty-four employees who worked third watch also rated the instructional quality of the SPAR training quite high (see S-Tables 83a & b). Twenty-four of them also did not find the SPAR training to be very useful. However, approximately three-quarters of these employees found the organization of the infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens course to be good or excellent. One hundred two youth correctional officers who worked varied watches considered the instructional quality of the sexual harassment training to be good or very good (see S-Tables 84a & b). Three-quarters of these employees also found the organization of that course to be very good.

Overwhelmingly, youth correctional officers were least satisfied with casework, water safety, and SOI training, with nearly one-third of employees finding the instructional quality and organization of these courses to be fairly poor and not very useful. These views are fairly consistent across all watches and all measures. The ward rights course also received low ratings among those employees who worked the first and third watches.

Twenty-seven employees who worked the second, third, and varied watches found the instructional quality of the casework training to be below average or poor (see S-Tables 82a

& b through 84a & b). Approximately 37 percent (N=37) of those who worked the second and varied watches found the organization of that course to be only fair or poor (see S-Tables 82a & b and 84a & b). However, youth correctional officers remained consistently dissatisfied with the usefulness of the casework training across all watches. Approximately 80 officers indicated that it was only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

The SOI training also received low ratings among youth correctional officers of all watches and nearly across all measures. For example, approximately 22 percent of the employees of all watches indicated that the instructional quality of this course was below average or poor (see S-Tables 81a & b through 84a & b). One hundred twelve of employees who worked the first, second, and third watches also found the organization of the SOI course also to be below average or poor. It is interesting to note that 106 employees who worked either the first or second watch did not find this course to be.

Youth correctional officers who worked the first, second and third watches also indicated low levels of satisfaction with the instructional quality and organization of the ward rights course (see S-Tables 89a & b through 91a & b). Forty-one employees found instructional quality to be below average or poor, and 63 of those who worked the first and third watches only found the organization of the course to be below average or poor as well.

Twenty-six employees who worked the second watch expressed dissatisfaction with the instructional quality of the communications course, while 40 of these employees did not find it very useful at all. Likewise, 14 of the employees who worked the varied watches were dissatisfied with the instructional quality of 37/38 mm gas gun training, and one-quarter of these employees (N=24) felt that this training was not very useful either.

Interestingly, only those employees who worked the third watch expressed some dissatisfaction with the institutional security training (see S-Tables 83a & b). More specifically, 14 employees found the instructional quality to be below average or poor and 19 employees considered the course organization to be relatively below average.

Among youth correctional counselors, most employees of all watches favored the first aid, CPR, and chemical restraints training across nearly all measures (see S-Tables 85a & b through 88a & b). Youth correctional counselors who worked the third watch also indicated a high level of satisfaction with the infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens course, with three-quarters (N=269) finding the organization and content to be very good and useful. Likewise, three-quarters of the employees who worked the varied watches found the organization of the physical restraints training to be good and the content to be useful.

Approximately one-third of youth correctional counselors also expressed uniform dissatisfaction with the casework, water safety, and SOI courses. Interestingly, those very few employees (N=3) who worked the first watch indicated that the instructional quality and organization of the casework training was good, or average, and that the course was useful.

The heath and safety course also received low ratings in terms of its organization and usefulness. For example, 28 percent (N=49) of those who worked the second watch found the organization of this course only to be fair or, while 40 percent (N=27) of those who worked the varied watches rated the course in this manner. Likewise, an average of 43 percent (N=96) of those who worked the third and varied watches did not find the health and safety course to be very useful.

Camps. Overall, camp employees expressed the most favorable views for first aid, CPR, chemical restraints, and ward rights training (see S-Tables 89a & b). In terms of first aid, 28 employees (90%) indicated that the instructional quality was very good, 26 (84%) indicated that the organization of the course was very good, and 25 (81%) felt that course content was useful. CPR received similarly high ratings. Twenty-seven employees found the instructional quality to be very good (90%), while 25 considered the organization of the course to be very good (83%), and 26 felt that the course was quite useful (87%). The chemical restraints training received positive ratings in terms of instructional quality, in which 27 employees felt it was very good (93%), and course organization, in which 20 employees indicated a moderate level of satisfaction (69%). Lastly, 21 camp employees considered the ward rights course also to be very useful (70%).

In contrast, room/cell extractions and health and safety received some of the lowest satisfaction ratings. Four respondents found the instructional quality of the room/cell extractions course to be below average. However, it is very important to point out that 18 employees indicated that the room/cell extractions course was not applicable to them and four employees found the instructional quality to be very good. In terms of health and safety, seven employees found the instructional quality to be below average, while 13 indicated that the course was poorly organized. In addition, five employees considered the instructional quality of the 37/38 mm gas gun training below average. Ten camp employees also indicated that the content of the sexual harassment/EEO and SOI training was only somewhat useful or not useful at all.

Training Areas That Provided the Best Preparation for Institution and Camp Employees

Institutional and camp employees were asked to identify which training areas provided the best preparation for assuming the duties of a youth correctional officer, youth correctional counselor, casework specialist, medical technical assistant, and parole agent I. We used the 17 training areas identified earlier. The respondents evaluated and rated the quality of this preparation according to a variety of factors, including:

- training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills;
- their level of confidence about performing their duties following training;
- their level of agreement regarding their ability to apply principles gained in 7(k) to work-related situations;
- how the training schedule impacts their ability to learn the material;
- their preferred learning styles; and
- the impact of particular instructional delivery methods on their ability to learn the material and apply skills.

Training Areas That Most Improved Knowledge and Skills

Respondents were asked to indicate the three training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 90). For institutions, these areas included infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens, CPR, and physical and mechanical restraints. More

specifically, approximately 31 percent (N=380) of institutional employees indicated that CPR improved their knowledge and skills, while about 26 percent of these employees found infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens (N=325) and physical and mechanical restraints (N=314) to be most helpful in this endeavor. Conversely, the courses which appeared to be the least helpful towards improving knowledge and skills included water safety, where only four percent (N=44) found it helpful, and 37/38 mm gas gun, where only seven percent (N=91) supported it.

In contrast, only seven camp employees (26%) indicated that the communications, casework, first aid and SPAR courses most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 90). The least helpful courses among camp employees appeared to be room/cell extraction, with no one indicating that it helped improve knowledge and skills, and 37/38 mm gas gun, where only two employees found it helpful.

Institutions. The data reveal that youth correctional officers indicated that training in physical and mechanical restraints, chemical restraints, and CPR most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 91). Approximately 35 percent of the respondents (N=178) indicated that physical and mechanical restraints were helpful to that end, while approximately 30 percent found chemical restraints (N=149) and CPR (N=145) to have been very useful. Only two percent of youth correctional officers identified casework training as improving their knowledge and skills (N=10).

Conversely, 27 percent (N=118) of youth correctional counselors found casework training to be most beneficial in terms of improving knowledge and skills (see S-Table 99). This finding goes with the nature of the duties and responsibilities that youth correctional counselors have in the institutions. However, CPR (N=139) and infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens (N=136) were two other courses that nearly one-third of the youth correctional counselors considered helpful in this endeavor. The 37/38 mm gas gun and water safety courses appear to be the training areas that least improved their knowledge and skills.

The data did not reveal much variation in terms of years of service and the training areas that most improved institutional employees' knowledge and skills (see S-Table 92). Regardless of years of service, most employees indicated that physical and mechanical restraints, chemical restraints, and CPR were the training areas that were most helpful. The physical and mechanical restraint course appeared to be most favored among all employees regardless of years of service. Forty-two percent of employees with less than two years of service (N=42) or between six and 10 years of service (N=43) felt that physical and mechanical restraints most improved their knowledge and skills. Twenty-nine employees with between two and five years of service and 58 employees who have served more than 11 years also indicated that the physical and mechanical restraints course helped them improve their knowledge and skills.

However, some individual differences emerge when service years are examined separately. Among those employees with less than two years of service, other favored courses included chemical restraints, with 37 percent (N=36) highlighting its beneficial qualities, and institutional security, with 31 percent (N=30) indicating that this course helped improve knowledge and skills.

In addition, approximately one-quarter of those with between two and five years of service and one-third of those with more than five years of service indicated that the CPR course helped them improve their knowledge and skills. The chemical restraints course also received positive feedback among 28 percent (N=26) of those with between two and five years of service and 30 percent (N=32) of those with between six and 10 years of service. Lastly, 50 youth correctional officers with more than 11 years of service (23%) found the first aid course to be very helpful in terms of improving their knowledge and skills. Once again, the casework and water safety courses were identified as least helpful. Less than six percent of employees, regardless of years of service, found the water safety course helpful (N=18), while less than three percent indicated any positive attitude towards casework (N=10).

Youth correctional counselors overwhelmingly indicated that the CPR course most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 92). In fact, regardless of years of service, approximately one-third of the employees with 10 years of service (N=82) or less and 22 percent of the employees with more than 11 years of service (N=53) found this course to be most helpful. Youth correctional counselors with more than two years of service also found the infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens course helpful. Approximately one-fourth of those with between two and five years of service (N=27) and six and 10 years of service (N=26) found this course to be helpful. Twenty-nine percent (N=70) of the employees with more than 11 years of service also found this course vastly improved their knowledge and skills.

The communications and casework courses received popular support from youth correctional counselors. In terms of communications, 69 counselors with six or more years of service (33%) found this course to have improved their knowledge and skills. Likewise, 16 employees with less than two years of service (40%) indicated that casework training greatly improved their knowledge and skills, while 34 counselors with between two and five years of service (32%) felt that this course helped them towards this end. Lastly, the SOI course appeared popular for 19 employees with between six and 10 years of service (20%).

Like youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors also found the water safety course to be the least helpful in terms of improving knowledge and skills. In fact, only 16 employees, regardless of their length of service, found this course helpful (12%). In addition, only 13 employees indicated that the 37/38 mm gas gun course was helpful in terms of improving their knowledge and skills (9%). Other courses that were not found to be very helpful in terms of improving knowledge and skills among youth correctional officers included workplace violence, health and safety, and room/cell extractions.

Like years of service, the data by watch did not reveal much variation in terms of whether employee watch influenced one's perception of the training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Table 93). Most youth correctional officers once again indicated that physical and mechanical restraints, chemical restraints, and CPR most improved their

knowledge and skills. A closer analysis of the watches reveals that slightly more than one-third of all employees, regardless of watch, found physical and mechanical restraints to be most useful in this endeavor.

In terms of chemical restraints, about 30 percent of youth correctional officers who worked the first, second, and varied watches found it to have improved their knowledge and skills. Approximately 35 percent of those employees who worked the first, second, and third watch found the CPR training to be most helpful in terms of improving knowledge and skills. Lastly, 22 employees on third watch indicated that first aid was also very helpful. Once again, a majority of youth correctional officers, regardless of watch, found casework and water safety training to be least helpful in terms of improving knowledge and skills.

Data for the youth correctional counselors also did not reveal much variation among the various watches (see S-Table 93). Youth correctional counselors found casework, infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens, and CPR training the most helpful in terms of improving their knowledge and skills. For example, one-fourth (N=39) of those who worked the second watch found casework training to be very helpful, while 30 percent (N=49) who worked the third watch also found casework to have improved their knowledge and skills the most.

In addition, approximately one-third of those employees who worked the second, third, and varied watches indicated that the infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens course helped them to improve knowledge and skills. The CPR course also received a lot of positive feedback from these employees. Forty-five employees who worked the second watch considered CPR to be one of the most helpful courses (29%), while 57 of those who worked the third watch expressed the same sentiments (35%). Seventeen employees who worked varied watches also indicated that CPR helped them improve their knowledge and skills (27%). Once again, courses that helped improve knowledge and skills the least among youth correctional counselors of most watches included water safety and 37/38 mm gas gun training.

Level of Confidence About Performing Duties

Institutional and camp employees were queried about their level of confidence about performing their respective duties after completing the 7(k) training (see S-Table 94). Overall, the data indicate a moderate level of confidence among employees with respect to their abilities to perform their duties after completing the 7(k) training. However, differences emerge when institutional and camp employees are examined separately.

In the institutions, 39 percent (N=228) of youth correctional officers, one-third of youth correctional counselors (N=167), 44 percent (N=8) of casework specialists, 43 percent (N=20), and 59 percent (N=10) of MTAs indicated that they felt very confident or extremely confident about performing their duties upon completion of the training. About 36 percent of institutional employees offered no opinion, or a neutral opinion, regarding their level of confidence about performing their duties.

However, 27 percent (N=139) of youth correctional counselors indicated that they only felt somewhat confident or not at all about their performance capabilities following training. Additionally, 22 percent (N=128) of youth correctional officers expressed a lower level of confidence about performing their duties upon completion of the training. Only two casework specialists, five institutional parole agents, and one MTA indicated that they were only somewhat confident or not confident at all about performing their duties following training.

The data yielded interesting findings when years of service were taken into account (see S-Table 95). The greatest levels of confidence could be found among 52 youth correctional officers with less than two years of service. The data revealed that level of confidence actually decreased as years of service increased, as with only one-third (N=74) of employees with more than 11 years of service indicating that they were extremely confident or very confident about their performance capabilities. Twenty-three percent of those with more than 11 years of service (N=50) and 26 with less than two years of service indicated that they were only somewhat confident or not confident at all about their abilities to perform their respective duties following the 7(k) training. However, it is important to point out that most

employees with 11 years of service or more offered no opinion about their level of confidence, thereby influencing the determination of which employees had the highest or lowest levels of confidence in terms of years of service.

Among youth correctional counselors, the data reveal that those with 11 or more years of service have the greatest level of confidence in terms of their performance capabilities. Thirty-seven percent (N=88) indicated that they were extremely confident or very confident about performing their duties following the 7(k) training. Likewise, those with less than two years of service expressed the lowest levels of confidence, with one-third indicating that they were only somewhat confident or not confident at all. Nonetheless, approximately 39 percent of youth correctional counselors, all years of service taken into consideration, expressed no opinion about their level of confidence. However, the greatest percentage of neutral opinions came from those (N=48) with between two and five years of service.

Overall, camp employees seemed to feel less confident about their performance capabilities than their institutional counterparts (see S-Table 94). Among youth correctional officers, none indicated that they were extremely confident, and only four felt very confident about their abilities to perform their duties. Three employees offered no opinion, while one indicated that s/he felt only somewhat confident. In the camps, the lowest levels of confidence could be found among the youth correctional counselors and institutional parole agents. For example, four youth correctional counselors indicated that they were extremely confident or very confident about their performance capabilities. However, seven of these employees offered no opinion, and six indicated that they were only somewhat confident. The only institutional parole agent found that s/he was only somewhat confident.

Level of Agreement Regarding Ability to Apply Principles Gained in 7(k) to Work-Related Situations

Institutional and camp employees overwhelmingly agreed that they learned how to apply the principles gained in 7(k) training to work-related situations (see S-Table 96). More specifically, among institutional employees, approximately 61 percent of youth correctional officers (N=348) and casework specialists (N=11), half of the youth correctional counselors

(N=260) and institutional parole agent I's (N=24), and 71percent (N=12) of the MTAs indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they learned to apply learned 7(k) principles to work-related situations.

A little more than one-third of these employees expressed no opinion regarding their level of agreement about applying principles gained through training to work-related circumstances, and only a very small percentage (less than 12%) of youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors, and institutional parole agent I's disagreed or strongly disagreed with the notion that they learned how to apply 7(k) principles.

When years of service are taken into account for institutional employees, the level of agreement with the notion that they learned how to apply 7(k) principles to work-related situations decreases as years of service increase (see S-Table 97). For example, a little more than two-thirds (N=79) of those employees with less than two years of service and those with between two and five years of service (N=64) agreed or strongly agreed that they learned to apply the principles gained in 7(k) training to work-related circumstances. In contrast, only 59 percent (N=72) of those with between six and 10 years of service and 53 percent (N=116) with 11 or more years of service found that they agree that they learned to apply 7(k) principles to work-related situations. Slightly less than one-third of youth correctional officers regardless of years of service offered no opinion, while less than 12 percent disagreed or disagreed strongly with the idea that they learned to apply 7(k) principles gained through the training to work-related circumstances.

There was little variation among levels of agreement in terms of years of service for the youth correctional counselors. Regardless of years of service, a greater percentage (36%) of these employees expressed no opinion about whether they learned to apply principles gained in 7(k) training to work-related situations. Nonetheless, youth correctional officers with less than two years of service expressed the greatest level of agreement (N=25) regarding the issue of whether they learned to apply 7(k) principles to work-related circumstances. A little more than half of those youth correctional counselors also agreed or strongly agreed with this notion as well. Incidentally, the lowest level of agreement could be found among employees

with 11 or more years of service. Among those employees, 16 percent (N=38) did not agree with the idea that they learned how to apply the principles gained in 7(k) training to work-related situations.

Among camp employees, most employees overwhelmingly indicated that they agree with the notion that they learned to apply the principles learned in 7(k) training to work-related situations (see S-Table 96). Six youth correctional officers, 11 youth correctional counselors, and the only institutional parole agent I expressed these sentiments regarding their abilities to apply what they learned in the 7(k) training to their jobs. Two youth correctional officers and six youth correctional counselors offered no opinion.

Perception of 7(k) Scheduling on Ability to Learn the Material

Institutional and camp employees were asked to give their perceptions of the impact that the 7(k) training schedule might have on their ability to learn the material. For the most part, many institutional and camp employees indicated that the training schedule had no impact on their ability to learn the material (see S-Table 98). More specifically, 514 institutional employees and 17 camp employees felt that scheduling did not impact their ability to learn the material.

In terms of institutional employees, 39 percent (N=226) of youth correctional officers, approximately 50 percent of youth correctional counselors (N=253) and institutional parole agents (N=24), 61 percent of casework specialists (N=11), and one-fourth of MTAs (N=4) indicated that the schedule had no impact whatsoever on their ability to learn the material. Among camp employees, six youth correctional officers, 10 youth correctional counselors, and one institutional parole agent felt that scheduling did not impact their ability to learn the material.

Few employees felt that it negatively affected their ability to learn the material. Among institutional employees, approximately 20 percent of youth correctional officers (N=114) and youth correctional counselors (N=108) felt that it negatively affected their ability to learn the

material. Only two casework specialists and seven institutional parole agents felt that scheduling had a negative impact.

Four MTAs were negatively impacted by the training schedule, while seven indicated that it positively impacted their training experience. Other positive reactions to the training schedule could be found among 36 percent (N=209) of the youth correctional officers, an average of one-quarter of youth correctional counselors (N=131), casework specialists (N=4), and institutional parole agents (N=13).

Data were also analyzed regarding the impact of the training schedule on employees' ability to learn the material based on years of service (see S-Table 99). Overall, little variation exists in terms of the length of an employee's service and the impact of the schedule on one's learning. In fact, nearly all institutional employees, regardless of employee classification or years of service, indicated that the training schedule had no impact on their ability to learn the material. It is also important to point out that, for all youth correctional officers, the impact of the training schedule was mainly positive, or it had no impact. For example, more than half (N=61) of youth correctional officers with less than two years of service found that the training schedule had a positive impact on their learning abilities. Additionally, about one-third of the employees with more than two years of service felt the same (N=137).

Nonetheless, a more precise analysis reveals that as years of service increased, the impact of the training schedule on employees' abilities to learn the material became more negative. Five youth correctional officers with less than two years of service felt that the training schedule had a negative impact on their learning ability. In contrast, nearly one-third (N=35) of youth correctional officers with between six and 10 years of service, and 23 percent (N=48) with 11 or more years of service felt that the training schedule had a negative impact on their learning abilities.

The data reveal similar results for institutional youth correctional counselors. Between 50 and 65 percent of these employees, regardless of years of service, indicated that the training schedule had no impact on their learning abilities (see S-Table 99). However, a closer

examination of the data reveals that, like the youth correctional officers, those with more years of service seemed to feel that that training schedule had a more negative impact on their ability to learn the material. For example, among those youth correctional counselors with 11 or more years of service, 29 percent (N=65) felt that the schedule had a negative impact on their ability to learn the material, while only one-quarter (N=55) of these employees felt it had a positive impact. Moreover, 22 percent (N=21) of those employees with between six and 10 years of service maintained that the training schedule had a negative impact on their learning abilities, while only seven percent (N=3) of those with less than two years of service and 14 percent (N=15) of those with between two and five years of service expressed similar sentiments.

Data were also collected on institutional employees' perceptions of the training schedule on their ability to learn the material according to their particular watch. For the most part, employees on all watches indicated that the schedule had no impact on learning ability (see S-Table 100). However, a closer analysis reveals some differences. Both youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors on first watch felt the schedule had a negative impact on their ability to learn the material. More specifically, 37 percent (N=48) of youth correctional officers and half of the youth correctional counselors (N=2) who worked the first watch indicated that the training schedule negatively impacted their ability to learn the material.

Institutional employees who worked the other watches overwhelmingly indicated that the training schedule did not impact their ability to learn the material at all. More specifically, 43 percent (N=55) of the youth correctional officers and nearly half (N=85) of the youth correctional counselors who worked the second watch found that the training schedule did not have an impact on their learning abilities. Likewise, a little more than half of the youth correctional officers (N=40) and youth correctional counselors (N=102) who worked the third watch expressed similar sentiments. Forty-two percent (N=46) of those youth correctional officers and nearly half (N=34) of those youth correctional counselors who worked the varied watches also found that the training schedule had no affect on their learning abilities.

Many institutional employees also indicated that the training schedule had a positive impact on their ability to learn the material. Among those who worked the first watch, 30 percent (N=40) of youth correctional officers felt that the training schedule influenced their learning abilities positively. Similar views could be found among 36 percent (N=46) of youth correctional officers who worked the second watch and 40 percent (N=44) of those same employees who worked a varied watch. Among youth correctional officers, about one-third (N=113) of those from the second, third, and varied watches all indicated that the training schedule positively influenced their ability to learn the material.

Among camp employees, both youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors indicated that, for the most part, the training schedule had no impact on their ability to learn the material (see S-Table 98). Six youth correctional officers and 10 youth correctional counselors expressed these exact sentiments. Among youth correctional officers, one employee felt that the training schedule had a positive impact on learning ability while another employee felt that it had a negative impact. Similarly, five youth correctional counselors felt that the training schedule had a positive impact on ability to learn the material while two employees felt that it had a negative impact.

Preferred Learning Styles

Institutional and camp employees were asked to indicate their preferred learning style (see S-Table 101). Learning styles included videos, lectures, discussions, and hands-on. Overwhelmingly, the most preferred learning styles among institutional and camp employees were hands-on and videos. Among institutional employees, 40 percent (N=231) of youth correctional officers, 28 percent (N=145) of youth correctional counselors, 39 percent (N=7) of casework specialists, and nearly half (N=8) of MTAs preferred a hands-on learning style. Twenty-seven (N=141) of youth correctional counselors and one-third of institutional parole agents (N=16) preferred videos. For nearly all institutional employees, lectures were the least preferred learning style. However, for MTAs, discussions were actually the least preferred, with only one employee indicating a preference for this particular style.

Among camp employees, a vast majority of youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors, and institutional parole agents preferred a hands-on style. In fact, no one indicated any support for lectures, and very few employees indicated any preference for videos. Discussions received support from six youth correctional counselors, but only from one youth correctional officer and one institutional parole agent.

Delivery Methods and Their Impact on Ability to Learn Material

Institutional and camp employees were asked to indicate the level of usefulness of delivery methods in terms of their ability to facilitate learning the material and applying the skills (see S-Tables 102 and 103a & b) and queried about the methods that most improved their knowledge and skills (see S-Tables 104 and 105). Eleven delivery methods were identified. These methods included lecture, PowerPoint, video training tapes (videos), scenarios, group work, demonstrations, role play/hands-on, handouts, open discussion, personal experience, and other (specify).

Demonstrations, videos, open discussion, role play/hands-on, and scenarios were the most favored delivery methods among these employees (see S-Table 104). In addition, institutional and camp employees also indicated that all delivery methods were generally useful in terms of helping them learn the material and apply skills. However, demonstrations, open discussion, and scenarios were clearly the most useful delivery methods in terms of helping them learn the material and apply skills (see S-Table 102). The least useful delivery methods among institutional and camp employees included group work, PowerPoint, handouts, and lecture.

Institutions. The data reveal that demonstrations appeared to be the most helpful delivery method for 41 percent of these employees (N=505), while 40 percent (N=492) learned best from the video training tapes, and 35 percent (N=436) learned best from open discussion (see S-Table 104). PowerPoint appeared to be the least helpful delivery method in terms of enabling institutional employees to learn the material and apply skills, with only 13 percent (N=164) indicating that it helped them toward these ends the most.

A more precise analysis of the data reveal some similarities and differences among youth correctional officers and youth correctional counselors. For example, among 41 percent of youth correctional officers, demonstration (N=216), video (N=195), and role play/hands-on (N=192) were the three delivery methods that most improved their abilities to learn the material and apply skills. Once again, PowerPoint was least helpful in terms of improving their ability to learn the material and apply skills, with only nine percent (N=46) of youth correctional officers indicating any support for this delivery method.

Like youth correctional officers, demonstrations seemed to be one of the most favored delivery methods for youth correctional counselors (see S-Table 105). Thirty-eight percent (N=170) of youth correctional counselors indicated that this delivery method was one of four that most helped them learn the material and apply skills. Unlike youth correctional officers, other favored delivery methods included videos and open discussion. More specifically, 39 percent (N=174) of these employees indicated that open discussion was the delivery method that facilitated their learning and application of skills. Moreover, nearly one-third of youth correctional counselors noted the strengths of videos (N=187) as a delivery method. Once again, PowerPoint did not garner much favor among these employees, with only 17 percent (N=76) indicating that it improved their ability to learn the material and apply skills. Likewise, only 17 percent (N=78) of youth correctional counselors found that handouts were helpful.

Youth correctional officers and correctional counselors were also asked to rate these instructional delivery methods in terms of their usefulness (see S-Tables 103a & b). Among youth correctional officers, the data indicate that demonstrations (N=429; 81%), open discussion (N=410; 77%), videos (N=395; 74%), and personal experience (N=391; 74%) were very useful in terms of learning material. Approximately two-thirds of youth correctional officers also indicated that demonstrations, scenarios, and open discussion were the most useful in terms of applying skills. PowerPoint and handouts were identified as delivery methods that were least valuable in terms of learning the material and applying the skills. Thirty-percent also indicated that lectures were not very useful.

Youth correctional counselors expressed similar views to those of youth correctional officers; however, some differences existed. In terms of learning the material, a little more than three-quarters of youth correctional counselors found demonstrations (N=374) and open discussion (N=379) to be very useful. Other useful courses in this context included videos (N=349), scenarios (N=347), and personal experience (N=351). With respect to applying skills, nearly two-thirds (N=317) of youth correctional counselors found open discussion to be very useful, while 59 percent noted the usefulness of personal experience (N=293) and videos (N=281).

There were also several delivery methods that were not very useful in terms of helping youth correctional counselors learn the material and apply the skills. In terms of learning the material, 38 percent of youth correctional counselors indicated that handouts (N=194), role play/hands-on (N=185), group work (N=180), and lecture (N=183) were not very useful at all. Like youth correctional officers, the data reveal that a little more than one-third of youth correctional counselors found lecture (N=180), handouts (N=177), and PowerPoint (N=156) relatively useless in terms of skill application.

Camps. Camp employees felt that role play/hands-on experiences improved their ability to learn the material and apply skills, although they also rated lectures and scenarios fairly high (see S-Table 104). More specifically, over half (16) supported the use of role play/hands-on, while 11 said that lectures improved their learning. Ten employees also indicated that scenarios helped them learn the material and apply skills as well. Like institutional employees, PowerPoint did not seem to improve employees' ability to learn the material or apply skills at all. In fact, not one camp employee found PowerPoint to be helpful to this end.

Improvement of 7(k) Training Over the Preceding Six Months

Both institutional and camp employees were queried about the quality and usefulness of this training in terms of whether it improved during the last six months (see S-Table 106). Among institutional employees, an average of 55 percent of youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors, casework specialists, and institutional parole agents all

indicated that the training did, in fact, improve over the preceding six months. However, 47 percent of MTAs felt that 7(k) did not improve over this time period.

Among camp employees, a greater percentage indicated that 7(k) did not improve over the past six months. Seven of the nine youth correctional officers noted the lack of improvement in 7(k). Although more youth correctional counselors felt that their training had improved during this time period, the differences between those who felt it improved compared with those who felt it did not were negligible. Eight of the 17 youth correctional counselors felt that the training did improve during this time period, while seven did not.

A closer analysis of the length of service was done to see if it played a role in employees' perceptions of the improvement of 7(k) (see S-Table 107). Overall, the longer the service record, the greater the tendency to believe that 7(k) had not improved over the course of the six-month time period. However, this data did reveal some differences among the various employee classifications and the length of their service. Interestingly, among youth correctional officers and counselors, employees with 11 years of service or more made up the greatest percentage of those who felt that 7(k) had improved. Among casework specialists, those with between six and 10 years recognized the improvement in training.

Another interesting finding concerns the fact that, among parole agent I's, the greatest percentage of employees who felt that 7(k) improved included those who had served for 11 years or more. But in terms of those employees who felt that 7(k) did not improve over the past six months, a high percentage (over three-quarters) of those MTAs and parole agent I's who served 11 or more years indicated that it did not improve. In fact, among all institutional employees, those with 11 years of service or more also made up the greatest percentage of employees who felt the training did not improve. Overall, employees with less than five years of service were evenly divided between those who saw improvement and those who did not see improvement during the preceding six-month time period.

Overall Impressions of 7(k) Training and Recommendations for Improvement

Institutional and camp youth correctional officers, youth correctional counselors, casework specialists and medical technical assistants were asked to write any comments about their overall impression of 7(k) training. Given the vast range of responses, we classified respondents' impressions into 14 categories that represent the general intent of the individual responses:

- Great: impressive, has improved much, better than old method, very useful/helpful/good, I like it;
- Useful: good review/update, applies to job, helps meet mandatory requirements, good material, needed, helpful;
- Generally okay training: fine, fair, good, satisfactory, improving;
- Instructor quality: poor instructors, instructor influence on class, need better qualified instructors;
- Great!: specific instructor named, rave reviews;
- Repetitive: same material over and over, need new and broader range of materials;
- General dissatisfaction: waste of time, don't like it, it's boring, trying to nullify liability, not worth 5 percent extra pay, get rid of it, don't want to be there;
- Information not relevant: doesn't apply, needs to be updated and expanded, conflicts with other information;
- Class length: too long, break into two 2-hour blocks, trainers struggle to fill 4 hours, too short/need more;
- Training schedule: takes away from family, fatigue, hard after first watch, class frequency/times, don't like extra hours;
- Preferred training schedule: should be held during regular work hours;
- Recommended teaching techniques: more hands-on, videos, scenarios, make fun/interesting, return to block training, more on-the-job training, identified training preferences;
- General comments: others make it difficult to learn, bad class environment, difficult in camp setting, quality varies; and

Institutional Youth Correctional Peace Officers. *Overall Impressions.* Approximately 29 percent (N=333) of the responding correctional officers (including counselors, casework specialists, and medical technical assistants) indicated that the training and information was good, useful and assisted them in terms of their work (see Table 10). Many respondents stated that the training provided useful updates on departmental policies and procedures, helped them perform their job better, and refined their knowledge, skills and abilities. The training was considered especially useful if it was job-related, and you were provided the opportunity to apply it. Others suggested that the training was particularly useful for new employees.

Almost 15 percent (N=175) of the respondents indicated a general level of satisfaction with the training. Their comments included: "it has helped me in some areas," "most is useful," "worth the learning experience to attend and apply," and "it's okay." There was an almost equal number of respondents who felt the training was a waste of time, and that much of the information was repetitive and redundant. Several stated that, "They teach the same thing over and over again," and the material is "repetitious and redundant." Others suggested taking the money away because of the poor quality of the training, the instructors and the scheduling.

Table 10. Coded Comments of Impressions Made by CYA Correctional Peace Officers

Coded Comments of Impressions	Number	Percent
Training/information good, useful, helpful	*333*	28.8
Fair, good, average, ok	*175*	15.1
Waste of time, dislike, useless, hate it	*136*	11.7
Scheduling makes long day	*107*	9.2
Good, useful, but?	*77*	6.6
Better, new materials	*63*	5.4
Better instructors	*58*	5.0
Information repetitive	*53*	4.6
Some good, useful/others not	*47*	4.1
Relevant to work	*40*	3.5
Needed/necessary	*40*	3.5
Too long, boring	*34*	2.9
Get rid of it	*33*	2.8
Required/mandated	*31*	2.7
Excellent, great	*20*	1.7
Improving	*16*	1.4
Hands on	*13*	1.1
Money/policy issues	*16*	1.4

Note: More than one response possible

The issue of scheduling is an important component of the relative levels of satisfaction expressed by the respondents. Many were frustrated with the 12-hour training day and indicated that this was a hardship for those working first watch (i.e., 10:00 p.m. to

6:00 a.m.). Fatigue was of particular concern for officers on first watch, as well as concern for their safety when driving long distances to their homes. They indicated that it was "difficult to stay awake and/or stimulated after working for 8 hours," and that the 12-hour day "causes a poor response coming into training."

Forty respondents (4%) stated that the training wasn't relevant to their work. The issue of relevancy was raised several times as it relates to the needs of youth correctional officers versus youth correctional counselors. Most of the comments made by the YCC's suggested that they were dissatisfied with 7(k) training because it was designed for the officers, not correctional counselors. There was an expressed need for "casework training, small groups and preparing IIPP's."

There were many comments about the quality of the training material and the instructors. A number of respondents were dissatisfied with the videos, handouts and other training materials. As one respondent indicated "Get some new material. Generally a bunch of dry repetitive information," while another stated that the "video tapes need to be more professionally done." There were also many comments made about instructor quality (e.g.,"depending on who is training, we either learn the material or dread the time"), indicating that better prepared and more experienced subject-matter experts should be used as instructors. In addition, several indicated that instructors "filled the time" with irrelevant information or videos in order to keep them in training for the full four hours.

Their overall responses suggested variability in the quality of 7(k) training, whether attributed to the locality of the institution, the training staff and/or training materials, or the other officers in the class. There were also a number of respondents who stated that this training was only "liability coverage for the department." They believed it was not about creating a better trained staff, but rather used by the department to 'cya.' A number just wanted to "get rid of it" and return to the old way of training, when it was offered during an employee's workday. Finally, there were many respondents who asked to have more scenario-type training and hands-on training, especially in areas such as physical/mechanical/chemical restraints and cell extractions.

Recommendations. While approximately 12 percent of the respondents wanted to get rid of 7(k) training, 22 percent (N=201) recommended both better and more updated training materials and additional training areas (see Table 11). In terms of training areas, the suggestions included: computers (with a lab); gang awareness; drug identification; PERS/ retirement; attention deficit disorder and other related learning disabilities; job stress/stress management; program specific (e.g., drug, sex offenders); report writing; small group work; security; room extractions; and worker safety and morale. The issue of training relevance was associated with new training areas, which was stated by 10 percent of the respondents. There was an expressed need for training that would better prepare them to carry out their responsibilities.

Table 11. Coded Comments of Recommendations Made by CYA Correctional Peace Officers

Coded Comments of Recommendations	Number	Percent
Better/updated materials, more subjects (video, computer, casework)	201	22.4
Get rid of, drop, terminate, cancel it	110	12.3
More hands-on/scenarios	107	11.9
Better instructors, more prepared	101	11.3
Job related, relevant to job	84	9.4
7(k) during regular shift	79	8.8
Scheduling, flexible hours	76	8.5
Fewer hours, shorter time, 2 hrs of training	66	7.4
Money/policy issues	28	3.1
Better facility/food	17	1.9
Good training, continue	17	1.9
Staff support for 7(k)	15	1.7
Block training	4	0.4

Note: More than one response possible

They also wanted a lot more hands-on training and scenarios. As one respondent wrote, "Old Chinese saying: Tell me and I forget. Let me do and I accomplish something." Many indicated the need for more open discussion, demonstration, group work and role-playing, and fewer lectures. The scenarios should also be site-specific and illustrate "incidents that occur in the institution and deal with ward fights and disturbances." After the training, participants should have the opportunity to practice in order to ensure proficiency and competency. The respondents overwhelmingly indicated that while there was a need for lectures/presentations, there was a greater need for role play/hands-on training: not effective "trying to teach grown adult basic elementary subjects – need more individual personal training."

Several respondents suggested that there was a need to provide an opportunity to participate in debriefing sessions in their units/yards. This session would reinforce what was learned in the training and also enhance the knowledge and skills of the supervisors.

Many respondents were concerned that they were not consulted and asked their ideas about training: "Have a committee from each institution talk to their employees and see what the areas of concern are for their environment." The department's manual indicates that each institution is to conduct an annual training needs assessment (TNA), which if conducted would address this concern. Another suggestion was to take some of the 7(k) training material, place it in a folder, and make the documents available to staff who want to refer to the material at a later date.

There were many recommendations dealing with improving the quality of the instructor pool: identify experts as instructors, including those with certain subject-matter expertise; create a full-time instructor staff, which would eliminate the need to just 'grab someone' to teach; use guest speakers and professionals from outside agencies; and ensure that all instructors are enthusiastic and energetic, not apologetic about having to train. As noted in their earlier comments, many respondents felt that trainers were filling the time with irrelevant information.

In terms of scheduling, a number recommended that training be offered in 2-hour increments both before and after the shifts. Others suggested that the institutions should have more training days and more training slots within those days. This would be especially important for those on first watch who could opt, for example, to attend training the four hours before their shift began.

Additional recommendations included conducting the training on one day (eight hours), scheduling 8-hours every two months, or offering training on a quarterly basis. These comments suggest a general dissatisfaction with the current training schedule that requires one long workday, and a desire to return to the block training that was used prior to the

implementation of 7(k). Another suggestion was to establish an annual training schedule, so employees could plan their vacations and comply with their training mandates.

Camp Employees. ***Overall Impressions.*** Twenty-seven respondents completed the section that asked for them to write-in their thoughts about 7(k) training. While the numbers are small, an almost equal number expressed dissatisfaction with the training ("royal pain," "doesn't work for the camps," "eliminate it") as those who expressed satisfaction with 7(k) ("pretty good job," "useful for job performance," and "good learning and training source when properly used.")

One respondent stated, "I believe it is necessary to keep updated on various materials, but wish it didn't fall on my days off." The camps present a unique environment in which to conduct training. Camp employees must deal with fire season, limited staffing per shift, need to schedule trainers from other locations to conduct training (e.g., psychologists to conduct *Clark*), and their general inability to schedule multiple training days in order to provide staff with sufficient training slots that eliminate the need for an employee to come in on his/her regular day off (RDO). The agreement, however, states that six of the seven training scheduled on an RDO must be at least 8 hours in duration. Thus, it recognizes the need for scheduling flexibility, including requiring an employee to attend training on an RDO.

Several respondents stated that staff need training, but it needs to: be offered by highly qualified personnel; be presented in a structured manner, with new subject matter; and update employees on legal changes.

Recommendations. Of the 15 respondents, three suggested 7(k) be done away with and two recommended the training be offered on state time. There were suggestions to: use more hands-on training, videotapes, group work, updated materials, and modern technologies (e.g., PowerPoint); minimize discretion of supervisors to determine what is considered 7(k) training; send more staff to T-4-T classes; use standard, accredited curricula and other more professionally recognized courses from accredited organizations; and ensure consistency in course material and clarification regarding what is new and what is old.

Finally, one respondent recommended training relevant to the workplace and another suggested topics relating to work, safety and morale of staff.

7(k) Training Course Offerings in Parole Regions

Training staff in the two parole regions contacted the supervising parole agents in the individual offices to request their assistance in compiling data on the courses offered under the 7(k) umbrella for a 20-month period covering all of 1999 and part of 2000. They requested data on the training offered, including class title, number of class sessions, length of class, number of staff trained and total training hours. In addition, the supervising agents were asked to submit cover sheets for all lesson plans. The data were then sent to research staff for review and analysis. The researchers received very incomplete data, including copies of staff meeting agendas that were interpreted as the agents' 7(k) training. Caution must be exercised when drawing any conclusions from these data.

The staff meeting appeared to be the primary venue for 7(k) training. The available agendas listed various topics, including briefings on departmental memos and directives, updates on programs (e.g., life skills, young men as fathers), and safety talk. Other discussion items and training included the following:

- Casework review (e.g., case notes and case summaries)
- Community networking
- EEO, sexual harassment, and hostile work environment
- Community presentations (e.g., law enforcement, service agency)
- Nextel refresher training
- Conferences and workshops (e.g., gangs, drug treatment, community oriented policing)
- Policies and procedures (e.g., operations review, updates, sex offender registration)
- Back safety
- Report writing, including Youthful Offender Parole Board reports
- Worker safety

There was some indication in the documents that 7(k) training was different from department mandated training. Though the data did not appear to support this statewide, other training

offered to parole agents included the following: firearm requalification, CPR/first aid, disciplinary decision making system (DDMS), defensive driver, staff-offender interaction (SOI), infectious disease, physical/chemical/mechanical restraints, ward grievance procedures, water safety, and suicide prevention.

Field Parole Agents' Perception of 7(k) Training From Focus Group Interviews

Seven focus group interview sessions, composed of approximately 15-28 field parole agent I and parole agent II specialists, were conducted in May and June 2001 during their parole agent refresher training (see Appendix 2 for format of interviews). The goals during each focus group interview were to:

- generate impressions of the 7(k) training program;
- obtain deeper levels of meaning and make important connections about this training; and
- allow respondents to react to and build upon responses of other group members because this process may provide ideas or data that might not be uncovered in an individual interview or a survey.

Participants were invited to respond freely and openly to several questions posed by the facilitator, and were assured that their individual comments would remain confidential, though they would be collectively summarized.

The interviews began with an opening exercise where each agent was given a three-by-five note card and asked to write down a one-word or very brief description of what the term "7(k) training" means to him/her. Participants were then asked to read their comments to the group. Responses varied, though the majority of comments centered on four main themes:

- *Perception that 7(k) is not being carried out as it was intended.* Among the specific comments describing these feelings are: "What training?" "Waste of time," "Nonexistent," "Eight hours of work = no training," "Inconsistent," "Major potential," and "What is it? Never had it." Similar comments representing the same theme described 7(k) as a staff meeting where agents were given a memo with information, and told to sign a sheet that confirmed they received 7(k) training.

- *Direct association of 7(k) with the implementation of an activity log*. A large number of participants described 7(k) as: "Weekly activity reports," "Tedious writing," "Redundant accountability," "Documentation," and "Requires more paperwork, not training." Participants described the activity log as a form that documented all of their activities in 15 to 30 minute increments. The use of this form was mandated at the time that 7(k) was implemented in 1998. Field agents explained that the extra two hours per week was intended for training, but instead, the extra time is spent on the paperwork associated with the activity log.
- *The extra two hours per week allotted for 7(k) comes at the expense of not being able to fulfill regularly designated responsibilities to their clients.* Some of the comments evidencing these perceptions include: "Quantity at the expense of quality," "Misdirected resources," "Fewer hours to complete our job," and "I'm forced to squeeze 10 hours of work into 8 hours."
- *7(k) is a management tool used to stop the occurrence of overtime*. Several parole agents relayed this belief with comments such as: "Administrative cutback/payback," "Creative negotiation," "Bad deal," "Union arbitration," "Controlling," and "Good for management, bad for line agents."

Participants were then asked to describe and discuss training received as part of 7(k). Their response revealed that 7(k) training was inconsistent from office-to-office. In fact, several field parole agents asked the facilitator to tell them what 7(k) was, and a few had no idea how many hours of 7(k) training they had: "I don't think it is recorded or documented."

Across all seven focus groups, comments about 7(k) training ranged from none at all (majority of participants) to a variety of methods and courses (see Chart 7 in Appendix 4 for a summary of issues). Some field agents qualified their response that they receive no 7(k) training by describing it as old wine in new bottles: "Old training equals new training; same old CPR, firearms, chemical agents, etc. training, but it is now called 7(k)." Also, several stated that they receive more on-the-job training (OJT) as opposed to real formalized 7(k) training. Others associated 7(k) directly with staff meetings, either by defining 7(k)

specifically as "staff meeting," or by explaining that most 7(k) occurs at staff meeting, and is usually about "some kind of safety thing such as don't use cell phones while driving, etc."

Field agents who said they received 7(k) training identified courses such as CPR /first aid, disease control, chemical agents, firearms, physical restraints, victim assistance, sexual harassment, crisis intervention, substance abuse, and tattoo removal. Some agents stated that training consisted of lectures provided by guest speakers from the community. One participant qualified this comment by adding his belief that only 50 percent of the information provided by community resources was viable, as sometimes these lectures were mainly sales pitches.

A few agents described their 7(k) as follows: "We are given a binder full of memos and documents and are told that this is part of our 7(k). We are required to maintain this binder, add information to it that we are given, and our supervisor will audit it. For example, if there is a new policy on sexual harassment, we are given a memo and are told to read it. Then we are instructed to sign a sheet, which signifies that we have received 7(k) training." Agents admitted that they could refuse to sign these memos, though were afraid to do so because of perceived consequences when discovered by supervisors and/or management.

Other agents described their specific experiences with 7(k) training: "Once we were shown a video of gang graffiti in Los Angeles, and we're in the Northern Region"; "For computer training there were 30 of us (field parole agents), and we were shown a videotape with no hands-on component;" and "I was told to log the time I spent cleaning my weapon as 7(k)."

When asked what they thought about 7(k) training, responses seemed to vary by office. Some agents expressed the belief that training means learning and acquiring new information, and that no real training was created for purposes of 7(k). Overall, feelings were that 7(k) is not valuable as it is currently implemented because agents feel they were not exposed to any training and thus could not apply any gained knowledge, skills and abilities to their work. Further, there is no mechanism in place to guarantee 7(k) has actually been received: "I've never been asked to prove that I was trained."

Comments from participants also revealed frustration. A few participants indicated that requests to approve training about supervising sex offenders, or how to deal with mentally ill clients, were made to their supervisors and were denied because the subject-matter did not relate specifically to the work responsibilities of the agent making the request. Participants were also frustrated with the fact that many of their 'instructors' did not attend any training-for-trainers (T-4-T) program in the particular subject area. Instead, common practice is for volunteers to be solicited from each office, and then provided the information to disseminate to other agents within their office. Repeatedly, agents expressed a need to have subject-matter experts provide the training.

Given that 7(k) was designed in part to enhance employee work performance, agents were asked how in fact this training affected their work performance. Several agents indicated that because nothing had changed, 7(k) had no affect on their ability to carry out their responsibilities. They explained that the intended use for the extra time was for training, but they did not receive any training. Instead, that extra time was spent on paperwork, including the required activity log.

Other field agents felt strongly that 7(k) training has hurt their work performance solely because of the activity log requirement, by hindering their ability to carry out their 'regular' responsibilities. They are required to account for where they are, whom they are with, and what they are doing for each 15-or 30-minute interval during the workday. It is cumbersome and time consuming to record each phone call, meeting attended, and mile driven. Further, agents explained that the information contained within the activity log is redundant since the field book, timesheet and travel log contain the same information.

Agents were asked to estimate the number of hours they spent per month exclusively on the paperwork associated with the activity log. They indicated spending anywhere from a minimum of four hours to a maximum of 10 hours per month: "It's a buffer to guard against overtime, yet 7(k) created more work and therefore necessitates us working overtime, but without compensation;" "Most of us like the people we work for, so we eat the time, and in

essence exacerbate the problem;" and "Oftentimes do paperwork and report writing at home, off the clock."

Many participants expressed anger about their inability to request and/or receive overtime, even when the time is needed to carry out their responsibilities. A common theme throughout these discussions was that most field parole agents work more than 168 hours per 28-day work period, but do so without compensation. Many perceived that their supervisors and management believed overtime was unnecessary; agents were told to manage their time more efficiently. If they did accrue some overtime, they might get written up as a "bad manager of their time." The following comment illustrates this point: "If you're at your 168, go home. If a parolee calls, tell them to call 911 and you go home. If a parolee's family calls, don't answer it, just go home." Many participants stated that their job is unpredictable, and oftentimes cannot be completed effectively in a typical eight-to-five workday. Parolees sometimes need to be seen at night or on a weekend.

Several examples given by agents suggest that overtime might be appropriate: agent is up to the 168-hour limit, and one of his/her wards is subject to arrest; agent receives call from other law enforcement agency to participate in a sweep involving one of the parolees; or parent/guardian calls agent and requests immediate intervention with a parolee. If an agent requested overtime to participate in these activities, s/he would almost always be denied. Several agents also revealed that they fudge their timesheet to make things balance; better to look good than to be good.

Field parole agents were asked how they would design and offer 7(k) training if they were in charge. Participants felt strongly that all field parole agents need some general training, and that this type of training could be most efficiently and effectively provided if it was standardized at a statewide level. Specifically, it was suggested that the parole training branch take sole responsibility for designing and coordinating 7(k) training throughout the state.

Participants expressed the need for a training manager (not necessarily a parole agent) in each office, and if not fiscally viable, a training manager in each district with responsibilities

for coordinating all training in the office/district. The training manager would also have a separate training budget.

The field parole agents then discussed how often and when to offer 7(k) training, the design of the training, and the topics to be covered in this training. All agents agree that training needs to be continuous. Participants suggested different frequency and scheduling for 7(k) training. Some agents advocate a 2-hour block per week for training, which focuses entirely on one topic, such as firearms, sex offenders, hostage intervention, sexual harassment or crisis intervention. Others prefer one eight-hour block per month on a single subject, such as firearms, defensive tactics, or substance abuse. While still other agents preferred two 4-hour block courses each month, spaced as evenly as possible throughout the month.

Agents recognize the difficulty in scheduling training at a time that permits all agents to attend simultaneously, since the office is never fully "closed." That notwithstanding, these agents feel it is necessary to separate work schedules from training schedules. One suggestion was to redirect incoming calls to regional headquarters for a reasonable time interval while training was offered.

There were many recommendations regarding the format and structure of 7(k) training. The most commonly suggested idea was that training should be standardized at a statewide level for specific areas that are necessary for all parole agents: firearms, defensive tactics, sexual harassment, etc. Each region should then be able to offer training that responds to local needs and populations, such as gang awareness, a topic that would vary depending on the specific gangs in one's region. Several agents expressed the need to recognize that parolees from Fresno may differ in many ways from parolees from Oakland, Los Angeles or Crescent City.

In essence, their comments suggested a continuum of training:

- standardized training for all parole agents on subject-matter of general need and interest;
- specialized training for agents working with unique caseloads (e.g., sex offenders, high risk, gangs);
- professional development training upon request (e.g., hostage negotiation) that relates to one's job and where the agent would return from the training and offer a mini-overview for other agents in the office;
- training that leads to a certificate and is work-related (e.g., casework counseling, crisis intervention); and
- training that leads to an associate of arts degree or higher, which is work-related and enhances one's knowledge, skills and abilities.

The parole agents suggested that there were various venues for obtaining the training that would enhance their knowledge and skills, ultimately make them better parole agents and strengthen their service to the community and the parolees. Several agents also suggested that some 7(k) training could be provided online.

Participants acknowledged that some training needs to be curriculum-based with lesson plans and measurable objectives. Many also indicated that there is a lot of training they need that does not lend itself to lesson plans, such as scenario training. This type of training would involve dividing agents into teams and providing each team with an obstacle or situation to work through (e.g., entering a house, making an office arrest).

They also want more hands-on training that require demonstration of proficiency, specifically in such areas as tactical training, gang apprehension, arrest procedures, and sweeps of houses. Furthermore, they expressed the need to participate in joint training with other law enforcement agencies in their local area/region. Joint training is needed because officers from different jurisdictions may be involved in an arrest or sweep of a house/dwelling. Their overriding issue was that they need training that makes them feel safer and more confident in the field.

Participants in all focus group interviews conveyed the consensus that they need and desire information and knowledge that is relevant to the community they are currently serving (e.g., mentally ill, physically disabled, drug abusing, HIV-infected, sexual offenders, gang associated). The communities they serve, including the parolee population, and the issues they deal with are constantly changing and are dramatically different from those agents dealt with years ago. Participants suggested that the training should reflect these changes. Their perception, however, is that both management and the administration are out of touch with what parole agents do and the communities they serve. One participant commented that the administration still believes that field parole agents deal with truants and bicycle thieves. In essence, their request is that any mandated training recognize the changing landscape of their work environment and ensure public safety and their personal safety.

Subject-matter experts and/or T-4-T'd instructors must offer some of the training. Parole agents also want to bring in professionals from the community, such as a representative of the district attorney's office to explain report procedures, a law enforcement personnel to bring in new drugs so that the agents could see and smell them, or a representative of the local gang apprehension team to provide an overview of gang membership in the area. There are four advantages to these community presentations:

1. Enhance agents skills in providing relevant information/reports to agencies;
2. Establish and strengthen ties with other criminal justice agency personnel within their community;
3. Facilitate agents' ability to work as a team when conducting searches, arrests, etc. with local, state and federal enforcement agencies; and
4. Make agents aware of other agencies policies and procedures.

Several agents stated that hearing from a social service agency representative would be most beneficial, because they would be able to determine if any of their parolees qualified for social security, or other types of services such as medical, mental health or housing. Participants recognize that these community presentations do not represent traditional training but feel they are necessary in the context of their field responsibilities.

Several agents expressed frustration with the fact that the department and specifically the parole services division has no policy on entry, room clearing and other activities essential to their work. They suggested that this occurred because of the departmental perception that field parole agents were primarily counselors/case workers and that their clients were young, inexperienced young men and women. The fact is that the parolee population is older, involved with drugs, more violent and demonstrates greater involvement in gangs than one saw 10 to 15 years ago. Several agents see themselves as law-enforcers as well as social workers, and expressed the need to receive training similar to that received by local police and sheriff officers.

Other training areas suggested by parole agents include: investigations; domestic violence; psychopharmacology; undocumented individuals; communication skills (oral and written); computers; securing evidence; court processes including sealing juvenile records; court testimony; time management; stress management; youth trends; tattoo removal programs; searches and sweeps; officer safety; casework; joint training with institutional parole agents; successful community integration techniques; and hostage negotiation. As one agent stated: "If I'm going to be taken out of the field, away from my caseload for training, then make it relevant for me." In addition, participants acknowledged that seasoned agents need different training than new agents, and that supervisors need to be trained as well.

Many participants stated a strong interest in attending training offered by the FBI, Department of Justice or other justice agency and having it qualify as 7(k) training. They indicated that because the MOU language between the department and correctional officers union required that training courses be CPOST approved, the out-source training by these federal or state justice agencies would not qualify. Thus, a recommendation is that CPOST develop two waiver processes:

- automatic waiver for training offered by the FBI, Drug Enforcement Agency, California Department of Justice, California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), or other recognized law enforcement agency; and
- waiver review process, where the department submits training material from a vendor (e.g., Sexual Assault Association) to CPOST for review and approval, but

not subject it to the same curricula standards such as lesson plans and measurable objectives.

This recommendation acknowledges CPOST's role in establishing standards and training for correctional peace officers, but also suggests alternative mechanisms that ensure quality and relevant training for field parole agents. The assumption is that the federal agencies identified above offer quality training. In the case of other non-state or federal agencies, there is a role for CPOST review, albeit not the traditional review process currently mandated for all training courses.

In line with the agents' perception that administration is not aware of what parole agents actually do in the field, several participants recommended that a job analysis be conducted in order to align training to work responsibilities. Apparently, a job analysis (e.g., work processes, skill maps) was recently completed but agents were unaware of it at the time of these focus group interviews.

Another suggestion was to assign an additional parole agent to each office. This agent would assume the following responsibilities:

- provide on-site (e.g., mentoring) training to new agents, including the opportunity for new agents to "shadow" a seasoned agent in the field to learn the appropriate ways to conduct oneself in the field (e.g., how to approach a residence, conduct a field arrest) in order to ensure the safety of the officer and the community, and work effectively with other law enforcement agencies;
- develop community resource contacts (including those with local law enforcement), serve as liaison for the field office and inform agents of these services on a regular basis;
- maintain community resource information in a computer database;
- facilitate needed training with office/district/regional training coordinator; and
- serve as relief back-up person for agents on vacation, sick leave, administrative caseloads, or emergencies.

Parole agents believe that this additional agent is advantageous for management, parole agents, the community and public safety. Agents will be better equipped to serve their parolees in terms of service referrals and constant coverage and new agents will receive the needed mentoring and opportunity to successfully transition into their position. The law enforcement, business and social service communities will also be more aware of the responsibilities of field parole agents and what they need to help parolees integrate back into their communities.

There was unanimous agreement that the activity log requirement should be eliminated. From their perspective, it is redundant of other paperwork (e.g., field notes, time sheet), a waste of time for agents and supervisors who review it, a management tool for selective discipline, and offensive to working professionals. The time required for completion of the activity log could be better spent in relevant training, which they assumed was agreed upon as part of 7(k).

Finally, many participants suggested that each office have an up-to-date computer that would allow agents access to CII reports, court information relative to their parolees (e.g., arrests, charges), and CYA and CDC web pages. Many expressed frustration with their inability to effectively and efficiently monitor the activities of their parolees.

Field Parole Agents' Perception of 7(k) Training From Survey Responses

Table 12. Number of CYA Parole Agents Responding by 7(k) Employee Class

Employee Class	*N*
PAI	*18*
PAII (Spec)	*22*
Unknown	*8*

At the conclusion of each focus group, participants were provided with a self-addressed stamped envelope with a survey inside, which they were asked to complete and return to the researchers. Table 12 presents the number of parole agents responding to the survey. Agents were asked to rate the quality, organization and usefulness of the training they received as part of 7(k) (a summary of survey responses is can be found in Chart 8 in Appendix 4). As data from the focus group suggests, there was tremendous variability in the quality and type of training provided as part of 7(k). The respondents confirmed these

impressions (see S-Tables 108). In fact, several areas of training were checked as not applicable, indicating that there was no training provided: supervision of parolees; investigations; use of force options; legal; office/field arrests; and community resource presentations (see S-Table 109a & b). These training areas are also the ones that participants in the focus groups suggested were valuable and necessary for their work performance.

Thirteen agents reported the overall quality of instruction as poor (38%), 10 indicated the organization was poor (29%), and nine stated that the material was not useful at all (27%). Only one respondent rated the instruction very good/excellent, while 14 indicated it was good/average (41%). When asked to rate the individual training areas by instructional quality, organization and usefulness of course material, 40 to 50 percent of the respondents rated courses on all three measures as average, good, and useful respectively (see S-Table 109a & b). However, almost half of the respondents rated the quality of instruction, organization and course materials for the weapons training as very good/excellent.

Agents were asked how confident they felt after receiving 7(k) training in the subject areas (see S-Table 110). The majority of agents were either neutral or somewhat confident/not confident that the training was useful. In terms of their ability to apply the principles gained in 7(k) to work related situations, almost one-third were neutral or had no opinion, and a slightly smaller percentage (N=12) felt that they were not able to apply the principles (see S-Table 111).

In terms of their preferred learning styles, 40 percent of the respondents prefer hands-on training, which has been a consistent theme throughout this research (see S-Table 112). Finally, the 81 percent (N=39) of respondents had the perception that 7(k) training has not improved during the past six months (see S-Table 116).

Overall Impressions of 7(k) Training and Recommendations for Improvement

Overall Impressions. Forty-four agents provided data on their overall impressions of 7(k) training (see Table 11). Most respondents stated that it was useless, nonexistent and questioned what 7(k) training really was: "what training?" "still waiting," "field parole has none," and "staff meetings." For the most part, the comments were negative, such as: "A lot of training is mediocre, mundane, and totally worthless in the trenches of work." Many indicated the only training they received was as part of their refresher training and quarterly firearms.

Table 13. Coded Comments of Impressions Made by CYA Parole Agents

Coded Comments of Impressions	Number	Percent
Useless, nonexistent	22	
Miscellaneous	5	
Wasteful, time away, takes time from duties	8	
Good/fair/average	9	

Note: More than one response possible

Several responded that 7(k) is not training, but an additional two hours of work each week. It has also been used to more closely monitor agents' hours and activities. As mentioned previously, each agent is required to complete an activity log. One agent also stated that it was intimidating and used "to forward disciplinary actions against staff."

Recommendations. Respondents want more work-related and career advancement training. One respondent indicated the need for consistent training on a monthly basis that addressed topics important and helpful to an employee's particular position. They also want employees to experience 'quality' training from experts, for example, in the field of criminal psychology, the FBI, the CIA and have more state-of-the-art equipment (e.g., weapons and bulletproof vests). Suggested areas of training include drug identification, arrest, search and seizure, building entry procedures, safe firearms handling, local gangs, and community resources. Others suggested the use of scenarios (e.g., shoot/don't shoot), joint training with

Table 14. Coded Comments of Recommendations Made by CYA Parole Agents

Coded Comments of Recommendations	Number	Percent
Make career relevant/work related	12	
Use qualified/trained instructors/experts	4	
Get ride of/discontinue	13	
More hands-on/scenarios	4	
Miscellaneous	10	

Note: More than one response possible

community organizations and law enforcement agencies, and the use of qualified trainers. Additional related recommendations included the use of role-playing, debriefing, and the development of parole-oriented curricula. Respondent suggested that the department offer training on one day a month or a "good two-day training covering two months." Finally, of the 41 respondents who made recommendations, 10 indicated their preference to "get rid of it" and one stated, "eliminate 7(k) in its present form and restructure to fit the needs of the agency."

On-The-Job Training

California Department of Corrections

While both CDC and CYA offer on-the-job training (OJT), only the training officers in CDC maintain data on this training. Thus, the following is a discussion of OJT in CDC, which was obtained during the interviews with the CDC institutional training managers and 7(k) sergeants. The information is limited, but does provide a cursory overview of OJT in the institutions.

Many training staff stated that the purpose of OJT was to provide remedial and refresher training, and to provide site-specific information that familiarizes officers with local policies, procedures and practice. It is also geared towards addressing issues specific to a unit, which may be influenced by the security level, demographics of inmate population in the unit, and other special circumstances unique to that unit/yard.

Most respondents indicated that the quality of OJT varies, depending on the interest and qualifications of the person(s) providing the training. One advantage, however, of OJT is that it is generally hands-on training, and directly applicable to one's responsibility. Several training managers indicated that OJT may be offered on a more regular basis and in a more structured manner in level 4 institutions. They described situations where they close a yard/unit (e.g., after breakfast and before programming) and conduct a 1-hour session on a topic or issue that is relevant to the work of the unit.

When asked to describe OJT at their institution, training staff described a variety of methods for offering OJT. These include:

- Quizzes in the monthly training bulletin: officers would generally receive one hour of OJT for submitting the completed quiz to the training office.
- Mini-lesson plans: these are provided to supervisors in the units.
- Watch meetings: information is distributed to officers.
- Tailgate meetings: training offered either while a unit or yard is shutdown or when pay is distributed.
- Self-paced instruction manuals: officers may check these manuals out of the IST office, complete any exams and submit form with a supervisor's signature to receive OJT credit.
- Training videos: officers check the videos out of the IST office, complete quiz/test and submit paperwork for time credit.
- Debriefings: these are generally used after a critical incident in the institution. They are used to ensure that all staff are aware of the incident and minimizes rumors.
- Flyers: officer reads pertinent material, completes test and submits for time credit.

Several training managers indicated that employees are encouraged to seek out OJT because it is reviewed as part of the annual evaluation process. The perception is that one's evaluation will be higher if s/he accumulates a number of OJT hours.

SUMMARY

The 7(k) training program created a formal structure for training rank-and-file correctional peace officers, represented by bargaining unit 6, in CDC and CYA. While there are numerous issues surrounding implementation that were addressed by the training officers during interviews, the focus of this summary was on what the researchers learned about 7(k), after its implementation, based on individual and focus group interviews and employee surveys. In addition, while the data was limited, a summary of what was learned about on-the-job training in CDC will also be presented.

Many respondents assumed that the training offered under the 7(k) umbrella was to be different from that offered under the block/mandated-training program. In CDC and CYA institutions and camps, the training previously offered as part of block training is now, for the most part, incorporated as part of 7(k). CDC parole, however, still had the required 40-hour mandated training, in addition to the 52-hours of 7(k). The data suggest that CYA field parole agents received some training in their staff meetings, and completed their mandated training hours (e.g., firearm qualification) as part of 7(k). The 7(k) program also shifted responsibility for training compliance from the officer to the institution/camp/parole office.

California Department of Corrections

Institutions and Camps

The training offered statewide covered the following 12 areas: casework; communications; departmental policies and procedures; firearm qualifications; health; inmate control; law enforcement; legal issues; safety procedures; staff-inmate relations; use of force; and other issues (e.g., gangs). Most of the training courses were either statutorily mandated, litigation driven, administratively mandated through departmental directive, or locally authorized. Training officers had little or no opportunity to offer any site-specific training that responded to local needs. In addition, they indicated that their training plans were often disrupted, on very short notice, by central office mandates to offer a particular training course.

The interviews with the training managers revealed the use of some innovative, unique and/or accommodating institutional strategies and practices to deliver training. These included: the development of self-paced instruction manuals; incorporating report writing

into other training; staggered start times to accommodate all watches; strategic posting of training schedule to encourage more balanced attendance; continual use of hands-on training; development of game format for training; use of table-top exercises; joint training with custody and non-custody staff; team teaching; and an institutional Web site for training plans.

The training officers also identified some major impediments to quality training. These impediments include:

- Limited instructor pool (e.g., interested, available, training-for-trainers certified)
- Inadequate classroom space
- Few standardized lesson plans
- Few opportunities to offer training that responds to local needs
- Limited use of active learning strategies, in part due to perceived requirement to read lesson plans verbatim
- Repetitive, redundant and out-dated nature of much of the training material
- Variability in class size due to officers waiting until the last day or two to attend, which also results in some classes during the primary training weeks with only one or two students
- Long workday for attendees

Overall, the training officers stated that employees accepted 7(k), though they did not like the long day, bad instructors (e.g., poorly trained, disinterested), and redundant material. They also indicated that there was a fairly high compliance rate, though there were always a few procrastinators.

When the union and department negotiated flexibility for officers to select any day for training, it created some challenges for the training staff. Specifically, it resulted in small classes early in the 28-day work period and huge classes towards the end of the work period. This was particularly troublesome and costly, especially for range training where range master and range safety officers are required at all times.

Summary

The survey data indicate that institutional and camp employees expressed a moderate level of satisfaction with the quality of course instruction and organization, and usefulness of all the courses. In terms of these assessment measures, the data revealed that employees of all classifications expressed the greatest level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction, while the greatest level of dissatisfaction was attributed to course organization. Looking separately at camp employees, their overall level of satisfaction appears to be proportionately less than that of employees in the institutions.

Data examining levels of satisfaction for all employees based on years of service indicate that satisfaction decreased slightly as years of service increased. Correctional officers and counselors with more than 11 years of service expressed more dissatisfaction with the quality, organization, and usefulness of training when compared with employees with fewer years of service.

Most correctional officers, correctional counselors, and medical technical assistants were very satisfied with firearm and use of force training across all measures, regardless of years of service or watch. On the other hand, most employees were least satisfied with legal training (e.g., *Clark*, *Armstrong*). Their dissatisfaction was related to quality of instruction, organization and course content. Correctional officers and MTAs also rated casework training extremely low across all measures. In contrast, over one-third of the correctional counselors indicated that casework training was very useful. Finally, correctional officer dissatisfaction with casework and legal training was consistent across all watches and all measures.

Overall, ratings of specific training areas did not vary much at all with respect to years of service. Most employees expressed moderate satisfaction with instruction, organization, and content of all the courses. Camp employees expressed the most favorable views of firearms, use of force and safety procedures training. Consistent with their counterparts in the institutions, camp employees found legal and casework training to be of average quality and approximately 30 percent found the course content to be only somewhat useful or a waste of time.

When asked to identify which training areas provided the best preparation for assuming their duties, institutional and camp employees overwhelmingly identified firearms, use of force, and departmental policies and procedures training. Only three percent of the correctional officers identified casework as improving their knowledge and skills, whereas almost 45 percent of responding correctional counselors found casework training valuable. The data was similar when looking at years of service and watch. With respect to level of confidence about performing their respective duties after completing 7(k) training, respondents indicate a moderate level of confidence.

Most employees indicated that the training schedule did not affect their ability to learn the material, regardless of years of service or watch. There were a number who stated that it had a positive impact on their ability to learn the material. In terms of preferred teaching strategies, use of lectures received the lowest level of support. One-third of all institutional employees and 44 percent of camp employees preferred a hands-on approach. In addition, respondents identified the use of video training tapes, scenarios, demonstrations and open discussions as their most favored delivery methods. Similar results were found for camp employees.

Respondents were asked if they received any OJT within the past year and if so, to indicate whether it helped them perform their duties more effectively. Almost all institutional and camp respondents indicated that OJT helped them perform their duties better.

Institutional and camp employees were also asked to write their overall impressions of and recommendations for improving 7(k) training. Twenty-five percent commented that they found the training to be great or useful. They saw it as an effective means of gaining useful knowledge, meeting mandatory training requirements, keeping skills sharp, and maintaining currency on departmental policies and procedures. Approximately 38 percent stated that it was a waste of time, saw no purpose to the training, questioned the relevance of the training topics, commented on the repetitive nature of much of the training, and identified problems with class length and schedule and the use of inexperienced and/or untrained instructors.

Summary

Confirming the observations of the training officers regarding the long day, respondents were generally concerned with the additional four hours of training after an 8-hour shift, especially for employees coming off first watch. They commented that the schedule affects retention and learning, poses problems of fatigue and lost family time, and would be better offered on state time (e.g., during 8-hour workday). A related concern with the 4-hour training block was that oftentimes, the instructor would fill the time with irrelevant material or provide long breaks. Many respondents also suggested that training would be more effective if offered in 2-hour training blocks and with better-trained and qualified instructors.

Camp employees, more often than not, expressed frustration with 7(k) training, especially during fire season. They noted that it was difficult to maintain a consistent training program in a camp setting because of the small number of staff and the need to use videos and/or handouts in lieu of trained instructors. As other employee groups have indicated, they do not like to stay the additional four hours, especially after first watch.

In the one focus group held with correctional counselors, participants indicated a high level of frustration with 7(k), ending with one employee stating s/he had received no training for almost two years. Many participants also indicated that training was focused on correctional officer duties, not correctional counselor duties.

During three focus group interviews with sergeants and lieutenants, participants stated that a lot of the 7(k) training was redundant, repetitive and that there was a general lack of quality in the training offered. They also reiterated a concern with the 12-hour workday and that in their opinion, there was no discernable improvement in employee performance as a result of 7(k). The recommendation to close the unit/yard for training is the same offered by the training officers and the employees.

When asked about OJT, most indicated that while there was probably a high degree of variability in the quality of OJT, the supervisor was the key. In addition, they stated that the OJT most preferred by employees was that offered in their work area because it was on-site, hands-on, done during work hours, and had direct relevance to their work responsibilities.

Our initial discussions with the training managers revealed that OJT is provided in a variety of formats and venues: quizzes; mini-lesson plans; watch meetings; tailgate meetings (e.g., when yard shut down); self-paced instruction manuals with tests; training videos; debriefings after critical incident; and flyers. The quality varies, depending on the interest and qualifications of the person(s) providing the training. One advantage, however, of OJT is that it is generally hands-on training, directly applicable to one's responsibility.

Parole Regions

Parole agents must complete the 52 hours of 7(k) training and 40 hours of mandated training (e.g., firearms). Each parole agent submits a 168-hour schedule for the 28-day work period, which includes four hours for 7(k) and four additional work hours because they do not receive PPWA hours.

Under the 7(k) training umbrella, the courses offered include: supervision of parolees; case decision-making; communication; investigations; arrests; departmental policies and procedures; legal; community resource presentations; weapons/firearms; health; safety procedures; interagency activities/meetings; and other (e.g., peer audits). The regional offices coordinate the mandatory training, while training in the units and districts appears to be less structured and more focused on local issues and needs.

The four regional training coordinators stated that training is valuable only if it is relevant. Instructional strategies vary, depending on whether the course is mandated and has a lesson plan, and whether the training is offered at the unit, district or region level. Respondents indicated that the more informal training at the unit level (e.g., community presentations) is beneficial because it relates directly to the duties of parole agents. Selection of instructors varied by region: one looked for instructors who were T-4-T'd while another had a sufficient number of in-house trainers to teach a majority of the classes.

There were several concerns expressed regarding 7(k): some course mandates less relevant for parole agents; departmental need to review annual mandates; and an insufficient number

of trained and interested instructors. The respondents also indicated that while most agents were getting used to 7(k), they would probably be happy if it went away.

Parole agent I's and parole agent II specialists, like most other employee groups, expressed moderate satisfaction with 7(k) training in terms of instructional quality, organization, and usefulness of material. A more detailed examination indicates that 40 percent of the responding agents indicated that instruction and course organization were poor or fair, while another 50 percent found instructional quality to be good/average. When rating the usefulness of material, one-third of the agents found the material useful, while 15 percent indicated that it was not useful at all or a waste of time. The data also indicate that overall, as years of service increased, levels of satisfaction with instruction, organization, and course material decreased.

Most agents expressed a high level of satisfaction with almost all of the specific training areas in terms of quality of instruction, while their ratings of course organization and usefulness of course material by training area were not as high. Approximately 40 percent of the agents rated organization of the investigations, communications, interagency activities, legal and community presentations to be poor or fair. While the number of parole agent II specialists was relatively small when compared to parole agent I's, the data reveal that parole agent II specialists had a slightly higher level of dissatisfaction with course organization and usefulness of course material across most training areas.

The respondents identified four training areas that most improved their knowledge and skills: arrests; supervision of parolees; interstate procedures; and safety. A slightly higher percentage of parole agent II specialists identified case decision making and interagency activities as valuable in terms of improving their knowledge and skills. When asked how confident they felt about performing their duties and responsibilities after receiving 7(k) training, one-third expressed confidence and 45 percent reported they had no opinion on this question. Almost 50 percent of the responding agents reported they strongly agreed or agreed that they would be able to relate the training to their work situation.

These parole agents indicated they learned best with a hands-on teaching approach and they indicated that the more active learning strategies, such as role play/hands-on, scenarios and demonstrations, were the instructional delivery methods that were extremely useful for learning the material and applying the skills inherent in the training. Almost 50 percent of the respondents also found most of the delivery methods (e.g., lecture, video, handouts) useful in terms of learning the material and applying the skills.

Forty-seven percent of the parole agents responding to the open-ended question to provide their overall impressions of 7(k) were generally dissatisfied with the training. They did not feel it helped them in their day-to-day work, and it lacked quality in terms of instructors, instruction and course content. Several stated that their time would be better spent providing services to parolees in the field.

California Youth Authority

Institutions and Camps

The training offered statewide include the following 17 areas: casework; communications; CPR/first aid; departmental policies and procedures; health and safety; infectious disease; institutional security; physical/mechanical/chemical restraints; room/cell extraction; 37/38 mm gas gun; sexual harassment/EEO; SOI; SPAR; ward rights; water safety; workplace violence; and other (e.g., computers, gangs). CYA, unlike CDC, does not assign a full-time training officer position in each institution. In fact, many of the individuals interviewed have other duties and the training unit is their secondary or tertiary responsibility.

The interviews revealed some 'best practices' including the use of some innovative strategies and processes. These best practices include team teaching, use of a game format (e.g., Who Wants To Be A Millionaire), and on-site briefings while a unit/yard is shut down. Other innovative processes include: requirement that a supervisor or manager attend all classes; that each class and instructor be evaluated; and employees attend training on a designated day.

Several respondents mentioned 'tailgate' training, which appeared to be more on-shift training offered by a supervisor or part of Cal-OSHA's mandated health and safety training.

In most instances, the training was informal but staff agreed that it was beneficial because it addressed issues specific to one's current assignment.

The training officers in CYA identified many of the same impediments to quality training that were described by CDC training staff. These include: limited instructor pool; inadequate classroom space; few standardized lesson plans; repetitive, redundant and out-dated nature of much of the training material; variability in class sizes, resulting in higher training costs; few opportunities to offer training that responds to local needs; and long workday for attendees. They stated that oftentimes the department issues directives requiring them to offer a specific training within a designated time period, which requires rescheduling the training.

Attendance at training is low during the first two weeks and very high during the last few days of the work period. This situation is especially difficult with size-restricted classes, including range. There is one institutional exception, where a local agreement between the union and the management allows for officers to be assigned a training day, with the flexibility to notify the office if they need to change dates. Training officers indicated that employees had varying opinions about the quality of instruction; they expressed a strong dislike for the 12-hour day, but want the additional pay. Veteran staff tend to view the training more negatively because the lesson plans have not been revised in years. This last perspective is borne out from the data in the surveys.

Though, on the whole, institutional and camp employees indicated moderate satisfaction with 7(k) training in terms of instructional quality, organization, and usefulness of courses, the level of satisfaction decreased with increased length of service. However, regardless of service time, a vast majority of officers and counselors indicated a relatively high level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction. Employees also generally indicated the relative lack of usefulness of the course material, regardless of their watch.

Overwhelmingly, institutional employees favorably viewed SOI, first aid, and CPR across all measures, with instructional quality of these courses receiving the highest ratings among all courses. Employees were also very satisfied with health and safety, and chemical restraint

training; they were least satisfied with casework and water safety training. While SOI was rated high on all three measures, it did not fare as well when looking only at course content. Then, over one-third of the youth correctional officers indicated that the course was only somewhat useful or a waste of time. Employees expressed the greatest level of dissatisfaction with casework, with over 40 percent finding it only somewhat useful or a waste of time. Dissatisfaction with specific courses increased as the length of service increased. In other words, levels of disappoint with the casework, water safety and SOI training became more pronounced with those employees with more than 11 years of service.

Camp employees expressed the most favorable views for first aid, CPR, chemical restraints, and ward rights training. They expressed lower satisfaction with room/cell extractions, and health and safety training, though over half of the responding employees noted that the room/cell extraction training was not applicable to them.

Respondents were asked to identify which training areas provided the best preparation for assuming their duties. Institutional staff indicated that infectious disease/bloodborne pathogens, CPR, and physical/mechanical/chemical restraints training most improved their knowledge and skills. The courses that appeared to be the least helpful were water safety, and health and safety. Years of service did not influence these findings. While only two percent of youth correctional officers identified casework training as improving their knowledge and skills, 27 percent of youth correctional counselors found casework training to be most beneficial.

The data indicate a moderate level of confidence among employees with respect to their abilities to perform their duties after completing the 7(k) training. However, some differences emerge when institutional and camp employees are examined separately. Anywhere between one-third and 50 percent of different institutional employee classes felt very confident about performing their duties upon completion of the training. Overall, camp employees seemed to feel less confident about their performance abilities than their institutional counterparts, though the number of camp respondents was relatively low compared with institutional numbers.

Summary

A majority of institutional and camp employees agreed that they learned how to apply the principles gained in 7(k) training to work-related situations. This level of agreement, however, decreases with years of service. When employees were asked whether the training schedule had any impact on their ability to learn the material, most indicated that the schedule did not impact their ability. In addition, little variation existed overall in terms of the length of an employee's service and the impact of the schedule on one's learning. In terms of watch, 37 percent of youth correctional officers who work first watch who indicated that the training schedule negatively impacted their ability to learn the material.

Employees were asked to indicate their preferred learning style. Overwhelmingly, the most preferred learning styles among institutional and camp employees were hands-on and videos. In terms of delivery methods, respondents stated that demonstrations, videos, open discussion, lecture and scenarios were the most favored approaches, but demonstrations, open discussion (camps only), and scenarios helped them learn the material and apply the skills. The three least useful delivery methods in terms of learning the material and applying the skills included PowerPoint, handouts, and lecture. Camp employees felt that role play/hands-on experiences most improved their ability to learn the material and apply the skills.

Both institutional and camp employees were asked whether 7(k) training had improved over the preceding six months. Most employees indicated that it had improved. When asked to write their overall impressions of 7(k), almost 29 percent of the responding officers indicated that the training and information was good and assisted them in terms of their work. Another 15 percent indicated either a general level of satisfaction or stated that it was a waste of time, and that much of the material was repetitive and redundant. Camp employees made similar comments regarding their dissatisfaction with 7(k). Collectively, these employees expressed frustration with the 12-hour day, particularly for employees on first watch.

Many of the comments by the youth correctional counselors suggested that they were dissatisfied with 7(k) training because it was designed for officers, not correctional counselors. Confirming other data, respondents were dissatisfied with the dated material,

and the quality of instructors. Their overall responses suggested variability in the quality of 7(k) training, whether attributed to the locality of the institution, the training staff and/or training materials, or the other officers in the class.

Parole Regions

Staff meetings appear to be the primary venue for parole agents' 7(k) training. In other instances, agents were handed binders with information to read and told to record the time as 7(k). They also received their mandated training, such as firearm requalification, CPR/first aid, DDMS, defensive driver, and SOI. The overall impressions gleaned from the focus groups and the survey data indicate that field parole agents generally did not know what 7(k) was and had not received much training that they perceived fit the intent of 7(k). A consistent theme was that 7(k) equated to the daily activity log, the requirement instituted in 1998 that requires agents to write-down what they do and where they go each day.

Many agents indicated the training they received was very redundant, out-dated and repetitive. It had no impact on their work performance, and the extra time was spent on paperwork, not training. Another theme expressed by the agents during the group interviews was that when they reached their 168-hour limit, regardless of whether there was an emergency or need to contact a parolee, they were told to leave the office. The department and/or supervisors would not allow agents to accrue overtime. Several agents revealed that they fudged their timesheets to make things balance because they felt that they had to work those extra hours in order to respond to a need.

The parole agent survey data suggest moderate levels of satisfaction with the quality of instruction, course organization and usefulness of course material. Agents did, however, rate weapons qualifications high on all three measures. The data also indicate that some agents were not receiving training in areas such as office/field arrests, supervision of parolees and investigations. These are the very areas that focus group participants indicated would be most valuable in terms of the benefits for their work performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

All interviewees and respondents recognize that training, whether offered as part of 7(k) or some other vehicle, is necessary in order for correctional peace officers to carry out their duties and responsibilities. There were many recommendations for improving 7(k) that were the same for both CDC and CYA. These will be described first. Recommendations unique to the respective departments will be addressed separately. Both the recommendations held in common by the departments and those unique to each department are discussed more fully in this report and in the Research Brief. Charts 9 and 10 in the Appendix 4 contain a summary of the recommendations offered by CDC institutional training staff and CYA training officers. In addition, Chart 11 in Appendix 4 provides a summary of recommendations based on interviews, focus groups, and 7(k) employee surveys, along with specific employee recommendations.

There was consensus that the departments needed to evaluate their annual training mandates and develop standardized lesson plans that allowed for incorporation of some site-specific information. Respondents also suggested that CDC and CYA consider establishing a statewide training calendar for mandatory classes. This would ensure that all employees are in compliance with training mandates and would facilitate the transfer of employees between institutions.

There was overwhelming support for enhanced T-4-T instructor programs, including one specifically designed for training office staff. The enhancement would include offering the program on a more regular basis and increasing the number of employees per institution who can attend the training program. Employees participating in the T-4-T instructor program would then be required to teach a certain number of classes at the institution. The more focused program for training staff would give them the ability to provide instructor coverage for most courses. In addition, they would acquire enhanced skills in general lesson plan development and design, and teaching strategies.

If the departments implement advanced training for IST staff, it will create a highly skilled staff. Currently, training staff generally rotate in for a term of two years and then return to a

position in the institution. Respondents recommended that institutions review requests by officers to remain in the training unit for an extended time, thus creating a seasoned and skilled training staff.

Training staff from the institutions, camps and parole regions also requested additional financial resources for training. The monies would be used to purchase needed equipment and training materials, pay for training costs for new instructors, and in the case of CDC, add a new training staff position. The institutional staff trainer would teach, provide assistance to supervisors with OJT, reduce overtime and pay behind costs for instructors, mentor new instructors, and assist all the instructors with class preparation. A similar position was requested by CYA field parole agents, who suggested that this person could provide on-site training to new agents, develop community resource contacts, and serve as relief back-up for agents on vacation or sick leave.

Designated classroom space, which is designed for teaching and has all the necessary instructional equipment, was a recommendation voiced by representatives of both departments. The training staff all indicated that the training environment influenced participants' ability to engage actively in their learning.

Representatives from both departments also recommend that designated training days be re-established for 7(k) employees, if only for the mandated courses (e.g., firearm, *Clark*). This would make it easier to schedule instructors, ensure balanced class sizes, eliminate the need to turn officers away in size-restricted classes, and reduce pay behind costs. It also has the potential to improve the quality of instruction by reducing the number of classes with two or three employees and encourage group interaction. All three entities (institutions, camps and parole regions) recommend that the department review the perceived CPOST rule that lesson plans be read verbatim.

California Department of Corrections

Institutions and Camps

The IST training staff and correctional peace officers subject to 7(k) made numerous other recommendations for improving 7(k). IST staff requested departmental support to develop and provide a new computerized training tracking system that allows them to generate useable reports, monitor actual training, document non-compliance, monitor officers' training mandates, and provide other needed information as determined by the institution and department. They would also like to see the department place all standardized lesson plans on the department Web site, maintain the site, and notify training managers of any changes.

Along with their recommendation for designated training space, the IST staff would like the following:

- New equipment, including dummies for use in the CPR class;
- A constructed mock prison cell for each institution, which can be used for hands-on application of the principles and practice of cell extraction, searches and communication skills; and
- Range 2000 program at each institution.

At least two institutions currently allow some 7(k) employees to meet their 4-hour training mandate in either 2-hour blocks or other configuration that ensures compliance with the 4-hour mandate. Thus, it was recommended that institutions be authorized to negotiate with their local union in order to allow officers the flexibility to attend training in other than the 4-hour block. This recommendation may conflict with the earlier suggestion that at least for mandated classes, officers be required to attend on a designated training day.

IST staff and the sergeants and lieutenants interviewed in the focus groups recommend that institutions be allowed to close yards for short periods of time (e.g., suspend programming for an hour, after breakfast) to provide in-service training and OJT.

In addition, some of the training mandated in CDC is a result of a court order. Many training staff expressed frustration with the lesson plans developed in response to these court orders.

Their recommendation is to include an institutional training staff representative in the discussions with the court, in order to assist in the development of appropriate curricula that is trainable and responsive to the court-mandated remedy.

Institutional correctional peace officers written recommendations for improving 7(k) on the survey instrument identified the need for more hands-on training, use of scenarios, unit/yard site training, more site and job specific training, and more videos. Camp employees expressed similar sentiments, including using the OJT model for 7(k) and providing more qualified instructors. Over 25 percent of the responding camp employees and seven percent of the institutional employees recommended that 7(k) be dropped.

During the one focus group with correctional counselors, many indicated their desire to get rid of 7(k). Following those comments, they suggested: more training on the unit using the OJT format; application of the PPWA to all correctional peace officers, not just those on posted positions; and 1-and 2-hour training increments. They also expressed a desire for more work-related training (e.g., classification and parole representative training).

The sergeants and lieutenants interviewed made several suggestions for 7(k) that were also stated by training officers and employees: standardize training; offer training in alternative scheduling formats (1- or 2-hour blocks; one 8-hour day); team teach; more hands-on; expand the qualified instructor pool; add a training officer position in each institution; provide Range 2000 to all institutions; and conduct employee needs assessment. Several participants also suggested that briefings in the units/yards could be used to keep staff informed about current situations and to minimize misunderstandings.

Parole Regions

Regional training coordinators emphasized the need to examine course relevancy for parole agents. Several coordinators also suggested that a workload analysis be conducted in order to ensure that regional training officer positions are assigned based on the number of agents and caseload characteristics. Another suggestion was to conduct training needs assessment

for parole agents. Finally, respondents expressed a need to examine the potential use and costs for on-line training, in such areas as writing remediation.

Field parole agents, first and foremost, recognize the importance of training that enhances their knowledge, skills and abilities. They recommend that the parole training branch take sole responsibility for designing and coordinating 7(k). When asked to write their recommendations for improving 7(k), agents strongly suggested the use of more hands-on and scenario-based training, more videos, expanded subject matter, and relevant training. Several training areas were recommended: high-risk entry; interview and interrogation; drug recognition; field tactics and arrest; and agent safety.

There was a strong desire for cross training with other law enforcement agencies, which recognizes the law enforcement aspects of their work. They, like the regional training coordinators, also want the department to conduct a needs assessment to determine what training agents feel would enhance their work performance.

California Youth Authority

Institutions and Camps

The most pressing recommendation unique to CYA is the establishment of a full-time training officer position in each institution. Currently, individuals who have other assignments fill most of the training officer positions. The training staff also wanted the department to provide lesson plans, policy updates, departmental directives and other essential information on the department Web site so that each institution could download the information.

Approximately 12 percent of the respondents who wrote in comments wanted to get rid of 7(k), while 22 percent recommended both better and more updated training materials and new training (e.g., computers, drug identification, job/stress management). They also wanted more hands-on and scenario-based training, and debriefing sessions in the yards and on the units.

Recommendations dealing with improving the quality of the instructor pool include using experts with subject-matter expertise, creating a full-time instructor staff, and getting guest speakers and professionals from outside agencies. Respondents also suggested various scheduling formats, such as two hours before and after a shift, one 8-hour training day, quarterly training, and more training days with additional slots within those days.

Parole Regions

The information from the focus groups revealed that many parole agents associated 7 (k) with the requirement to complete a daily activity log. Parole agents want to eliminate the activity log requirements. It is their contention that the log contains information collected in other documents (e.g., travel log), is demoralizing, and is used selectively by supervisors for disciplinary actions.

Respondents from the focus group interviews and the survey data support the standardization of lesson plans for core/mandated training. While they agree that training needs to be continuous, they recommend that training be offered in alternative formats, such as 1-or 2-hour blocks or an 8-hour day. Suggesting that the department does not acknowledge their 'law enforcement' role, many agents recommend the inclusion of training such as office/field arrests, investigation techniques, and sweeps. On a related matter, the agents recommend that the Parole and Community Services Division develop policies and procedures for room entry and clearing, and other activities deemed essential to field parole agents.

Many expressed the need for joint training with other law enforcement agencies, which would enhance their visibility, strengthen their ties with other justice personnel within their community, and enhance their skills. They also want CPOST to adopt two waiver processes to their training approval procedures: 1) automatic waiver for courses offered by the FBI, Department of Justice or other qualified agency; and 2) waiver review process for training offered by other agencies, where material is submitted to CPOST for review and approval but not subject to the same curricula standards, such as lesson plans. While this recommendation emerged from our discussion with field parole agents, it has relevance to CDC parole agents who also indicated a desire for more relevant and quality instruction.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The multiple sources of data collected as part of this research reveal a very complex mixture of support, confusion, frustration and ideas for the 7(k) training program in CDC and CYA. Employees' perceived that the 7(k) program would provide them with new training; what they got in most cases was the mandated/block training under the new 7(k) umbrella. Employees on posted positions receive four hours of pre and post work activity (PPWA) time each 28-day work period; non-posted employees work an additional hour per week. This created what many consider an inequity, because all employees must gather their respective 'tools of the trade' before beginning their workday – whether those tools include pepper spray, firearm, alarm, baton, cuffs and/or files.

The implementation of 7(k) created a formal structure for offering training, especially in the institutions. Compliance with training mandates then shifted from employee to employer, i.e., training staff. Implementation appeared to be easier in the institutions because of the existing training offices and confined venue. The geographic spread of the parole regions posed serious challenges for scheduling the training. Training for camps had its own problems because of fire season, geographic dispersion, and low staffing ratios/watch. Thus, camp employees indicated that it was very difficult to maintain a consistent training program.

There were some internal discrepancies between the various sources of data. The survey data indicate that overall, employees expressed moderate satisfaction with the training in terms of instructional quality, organization, and usefulness of courses. Yet, when analyzed and cross-referenced with the data collected as part of the training officer and focus group interviews, another picture emerges. Between one-quarter and two-thirds of institutional employees indicated that in terms of the usefulness of the course content, it was either somewhat useful or a waste of time.

When asked to write their perceptions of 7(k) training, more employees expressed frustration with the long workday, redundant and repetitive nature of much of the training, and lack of applicability for certain employee classes. A clear majority, however, indicated on the

survey that the training schedule did not impact their ability to learn the material. This may suggest that employees did not like the long day but were still able to grasp the material.

Parole agents in both departments expressed frustration with their training because of its failure to recognize the 'law enforcement' aspects of their daily responsibilities and the issue of officer safety in the field. They argued that the departments did not acknowledge the changing characteristics of their caseloads and the need to design and offer relevant training. Correctional counselors wanted more casework-type training and questioned the relevance of training designed for correctional officers. Correctional officers, on the other hand, rated casework training low and were very satisfied with firearm and use of force training. These findings suggest the employees want training that is specific to their classification, not just related to their position as a 'correctional peace officer.'

All employee classes expressed the desire to eliminate the 'talking head' instructor who reads the lesson plan verbatim, and incorporate more hands-on and scenario-based training. The survey data confirm this finding. Respondents expressed high levels of satisfaction with firearm and use of force training, and safety procedures. Thus, the data support the need to examine instructional strategies and encourage trainers to use more active learning strategies, including group discussions. Some training staff have begun to incorporate these active strategies and several staff have developed games for training.

The departments and individuals interviewed and surveyed as part of this research understand the need for quality and relevant training in order to enhance the knowledge, skills and abilities of correctional peace officers, ensure their safety, and comply with departmental directives, legislative mandates and court rulings. CPOST, in cooperation with CDC and CYA, is statutorily obligated to create processes and procedures that will facilitate the development and approval of training lesson plans and ensure quality training. The recommendations contained in this report provide a starting point for on-going dialogues between all the departments and their employees.